UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association English Language Edition

Vol. XII AUTUMN, 1960 No. 3

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

The Ecumenical Council and the Authority of the Church
Rays of Hope in Germany and Switzerland

EDWARD HANAHOE, S. A.

Peter: the Sign of Unity

BERNARD LEEMING, S. J.

The Future of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches

SALVATOR BUTLER, S. A.

A Supernatural Apostolate

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An Open Letter of a Lay Orthodox Theologian and a Reply
A Recent Question of Ecumenical Interest in Germany

ECUMENISM AND REUNION — BOOK REVIEWS

PUBLISHED BY THE SOCIETY OF THE ATONEMENT, GRAYMOOR
GARRISON, N. Y.

Imprimatur:

† Hector Cunial
Archiep. tit. Soteropolitan., Vicesgerens

Romae, October 28, 1960.

ROMAE - PONTIFICAL GREGORIAN UNIVERSITY PRESS

THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH

In spite of the fact that the Catholic Church is not a member of the World Council of Churches, the most authoritative representatives of that Council have frankly reiterated that the goal of Christian unity can never be attained without the Catholic Church. Father Georges Florovsky, a Russian Orthodox theologian and one of the leading delegates of his Church, declared at Amsterdam in 1948: « No genuine ecumenical cooperation, no real Christian community, no true unity of Christians can be realized if Rome cannot be included ».

Writing in the *Ecumenical Review* Dr. Ernest Kinder observed: « Every concept and every ecumenical action that excludes the Catholic Church because of the difficulties encountered would no longer be ecumenical, but Protestant and anti-Roman, which is entirely a different thing ». And Oscar Cullmann, the French Lutheran theologian, notes clearly: « The accomplishments of Geneva must not for an instant make us lose sight of the essential ecumenical problem which is that of the relations between Roman Christianity and non-Roman Christianity ».

Protestants, therefore, who are desirous of unity must strive to come to an understanding with the Church of Rome, and it is interesting to speculate how the coming council may eventually help them in this sense. For one thing, they do not recognize authority; and the Council may perhaps make them understand that an authority is necessary.

The teaching of Protestants with respect to general councils is in opposition to Catholic doctrine in virtue of its fundamental principles. According to the Catholic position, the Church, founded by Jesus Christ and established by Him to teach all nations, is sustained by Him until the end of time; to obey her is to obey Christ. Besides, the powers of hell shall not prevail against her. All this requires that she be infallible, that she be unable to betray the teachings of her Master. Consequently, when she is completely represented by the hierarchy, that is by those to whom Christ said: « Amen I say to you, whatever you bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven » (Mt. 18, 18), when she teaches a doctrine,

or when her visible head pronounces a decision — to him, first of all, was the promise given, and he it is who received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven — the word of the Church is the word of God. Now an ecumenical council is precisely this assembly of the hierarchy, that is, of the bishops united with their head, the Bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter and the Vicar of Christ. The Pope calls together his brethren, the successors of the Apostles, confirms them in the truth, and sanctions the decisions made with them. The decrees of the ecumenical councils are therefore, in themselves, infallible; they cannot be rejected without sinning against the faith.

The position assumed by Luther was exactly opposite to this. For him there is one sole authority — that of the Bible. There is but one guarantee for the correct interpretation of the Scriptures — the testimony of the Holy Spirit in the conscience of each of the faithful. The Church as such does not exist at all; she is composed rather of the number of those who are true believers, who have in themselves the experience of the faith and who are known to God alone.

The Church for Luther is therefore invisible, and her authority cannot be invoked. If a Pope or a council or a theologian affirms a proposition, the individual believer will consent to it only if in his conscience the Holy Spirit assures him that such a proposition is in conformity with the Bible. If this testimony is lacking, or if he is not in accord with it, then the believer must reject what is taught by the theologians, the popes, and the councils.

Not all Protestants follow the reasoning of Luther, but all of them maintain the principle that the Bible constitutes the only authority. With regard to a council, their stand is to examine and to decide whether or not it conforms to Holy Scripture. Even when they acknowledge a council, they comport themselves differently from Catholics. While the Catholic, above all, makes an act of faith in the proposition defined by an ecumenical council because he believes in the authority bestowed by God on the council and in the assistance of the Holy Spirit in the deliberations of the Fathers; the Protestant, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with determining whether the proposition conforms with the Bible, and if it is, he admits it — not because it proceeds from the council, but because it is of the Bible. The Catholic acknowledges the authority both of the council and of the Bible. He is certain that the council is in agreement with Sacred Scripture. He could prove this if necessary, but he does not judge the teaching office of the Church from on high as being of a different authority. As Pope Pius IX declared — in an expression praised by Pius XII in the encyclical

Humani Generis — theology has the noble task of demonstrating how a doctrine defined by the Church is to be found in the sources of revelation in the same sense in which it has been defined. The Protestant, however, believes in the Bible alone.

If Protestants were to attend an ecumenical council, without modifying their conception of it, the whole procedure for them would be similar to that of an assembly as the World Council of Churches, which enjoys no decisive authority and whose decisions can always be subject to revision.

Thus, His Holiness Pope John XXIII could not envision such a meeting for Protestants. His plan goes far deeper, and will be — let us hope — more efficacious. His intention is to demonstrate to them the unity of the Church, in all its beauty and strength, and in this way to lead them to the authority of the Church. For the attainment of such an end, nothing could be more appropriate than the celebration of a genuine ecumenical council. This is how the encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram* expresses the hope of the Holy Father: « The Council will surely be a wonderful manifestation of truth, unity, and charity; a manifestation, indeed, which it is Our hope that those who behold it but who are separated from this Apostolic See, will receive as a gentle invitation to seek and find that unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to his heavenly Father ». The unity of the Church, which is always visible, reveals itself in a particularly striking way in an ecumenical council. It presupposes a visible authority, itself finally reduced to unity.

In order to bring our separated brethren even closer to the coming council and to interest them more in its objectives, the Holy Father has established a special secretariat, which he has personally announced in a most paternal manner: « As a token of our affection and good will towards those who bear the name of Christian but are separated from this Apostolic See, to enable them to follow the work of the council and to find more easily the path by which they may arrive at that unity for which ' Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His heavenly Father ', we are establishing a special advisory board or secretariat, presided over by a cardinal whom we shall choose, and organized in the same manner as the commissions ».

Faith presupposes truth; and truth calls for an infallible guarantee. It is for this reason that the Church of Christ must be infallible — and with a visible infallibility. She has need of the Pope; she has need of the council, which in turn is valueless without the Pope. She has need of the rock on which she has been founded: « Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church ».

THE EDITOR

RAYS OF HOPE IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND

In was in Germany that there came about the second of the two great separations which are still a source of sorrow to Christian peoples. On 31 October in 1517, Luther posted his 95 theses on the church door of the Castle of Wittenberg, and on 10 December, 1520 he burned publicly the papal bull *Exsurge* which condemned him. Eventually the revolt spread like a great cloud of dust over a large part of Europe.

Is it possible that today the clarion call to put an end to the breach of more than four centuries ago will be coming from Germany as well? Actually, one may already observe a number of transformations in that country, still very isolated, it is true, but which in themselves are of major significance and which are capable of leading to long unhoped-for results.

Up until the beginning of this century, German Catholics and Protestants were living quite independently from one another. The religious persecution under the dictatorship of Hitler, however, to which they were mutually subjected, drew them closer to each other. Thus it was that they learned to know one another, to become aware of their common interests, and to collaborate towards well-defined ends. Although remaining separated, they felt — in the face of Nazism and Communism — that they were in a very deep sense brothers. Other causes also played their part, so that at the present time one may affirm that there has been real progress made in the direction of Catholicism.

About the year 1910 the intellectual liberalism brilliantly represented by Adolf Harnack seemed, in effect, that it must dominate, despite the fact that it threatened to reduce the Christian faith to the vaguest form of pietism. Yet the lesson of the tragic events brought about by two world wars, themselves intersected by a pagan dictatorship, called attention once more to a Christian conception of human existence and at the same time to the great truths which Luther had conserved, namely: the mysteries of the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. It became evident that those who share such a faith are no longer strangers to each other. These truths unite them, even though other substantial disagreements might still subsist among them.

Lutherans were also exhibiting a new attachment to their Eucharistic doctrine, by which they profess their faith in the real presence of the Body of Christ (simultaneously with that of the bread). In consequence, they found themselves closer to the Catholics than to the Calvinists, with whom they do not practice intercommunion. Devotion to the Eucharist has even led some Lutherans to enter the Catholic Church in which they have acknowledged more doctrinal solidity with reference to the Eucharist and more certitude regarding the power of the ministry.

A faith which is better nourished calls for a more animated, a richer worship. Thus, Lutherans have brought about a liturgical revival. An important group among them has reformed the calendar and inserted within it feast days of the Saints and of the Blessed Virgin Mary, assigning to them the same days that correspond to the Catholic calendar. The Immaculate Conception, however, and the Assumption are as yet excluded.

In its turn, the liturgical renewal has had its effect on doctrine. Lutheran bishops have reverted to the indissolubility of marriage, even in the case of adultery. They have likewise recommended private confession as well as the sacraments of Baptism and of the Eucharist.

A renowned theologian of the last century, Adam Möhler, was of the opinion that Luther's doctrine on justification constituted the very essence of Protestantism, and perhaps he was right. At the present time, however, Lutheran theologians hold that justification is not realized without an interior change of sanctification.

Certain of them have gone even further. Less numerous, but of a recognized influence, the leaders of the *Sammlung* (the Gathering) are convinced that all that is genuinely Christian must at the same time be catholic, that is to say, destined to be accepted by all Christians. They take as their point of departure the Augsburg Confession, which is an attempt at a reconciliation of Lutheranism and Catholicism, drawn up under the moderating influence of Melancthon. They would like to see this document studied by one side and the other in order that all contained in it which could be called catholic might be retained. The goal to which they are tending is union with the Church of Rome.

Among those who belong to the *Sammlung* movement is Dr. Richard Baumann, who admits the primacy of St. Peter as a truth contained in Holy Scripture. He maintained this conviction in the course of a much-publicized trial and was subsequently deposed from his pastoral functions. Dr. Max Lackmann, an excellent theologian belonging to the same group, has also been deposed. But these sanctions leave intact all the force of the arguments

brought to bear by these Lutherans. Such measures on the part of the Lutheran authorities can only be the cause of astonishment; for after all, if theologians read of the privileges of Peter in the Gospel of St. Matthew, it is in keeping with the principles of the Reformation to permit them to affirm it — that is, if the heads of the Lutheran Church do not wish to have attributed to themselves or to their tradition that infallibility in the interpretation of Scripture with which they refuse to credit the Church of Rome.

Dr. Oscar Cullmann, the noted French Lutheran theologian, on one occasion compared the diversity which exists between Protestants and Catholics to that which was manifest at the beginning between the Christians of Jerusalem and those who came from among the Gentiles. The comparison, however, is inexact because the early Christians, those of Antioch or of Corinth as well as those of Jerusalem, belonged to the same Church and differed only in their attitude with respect to the prescriptions of the Mosaic Law. In any case, the position of the theologians of the *Sammlung* in view of the coming ecumenical council bears resemblance to that of the early Christians in the face of the first council — that of the Apostles and the elders at Jerusalem: Let it be decided among brethren what should be professed by all — that, namely, which is truly Catholic.

Actually, at the Council of Jerusalem that is exactly what came to pass. After a long discussion, Peter arose and said: « Brethren, you know that in former days God made choice among us, that through my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe » (Acts xv, 7). At the Second Vatican Council, after the termination of discussion before and after the council, Peter will arise once more, and through the mouth of his successor, John XXIII, he will declare that which is truly Catholic.

* * *

Let us give our attention now to a voice that comes to us from Switzerland and which expresses sentiments awakened in Protestant circles by the proclamation of the Second Vatican Council. When it is a question of relationship between Christian confessions, Switzerland is not to be overlooked. The history of that country from the time of Zwingli and Calvin is replete first with religious struggles and then with reconciliation between Christian brethren. Geneva, which is the seat of the World Council of Churches, counts among its inhabitants a great number of fervent and active Catholics. One can also say that religious peace reigns in the various Swiss cantons, despite the differences in faith. Thus, Switzerland

offers a favorable terrain both for meetings between different denominations and for discussions on Christian unity organized within the limits of the same confession.

In December 1959 there took place at Zurich, under Evangelical auspices, an academic session which had as its general theme: Christ and World Peace. One of the lecturers, Dr. Peter Vogelsanger, spoke of peace between the Churches. His discourse on that occasion was of very great interest. It takes its place in that current among Protestants which is favorable to the celebration of the council and which wishes it success. Given the importance of Dr. Vogelsanger's conference, I should like to recall its principal notions and comment upon them briefly[1].

We find, first of all, that the lecturer expresses a strong condemnation of the existing divisions. They are the work of the Devil, and therefore it is wrong today to conserve them. Doubtless, it is not easy to refashion a broken unity, but to work towards it is an exigency of faith. A beginning has been made in that direction, and that is already a certain progress. The World Council of Churches, for one thing, has come into being. But nothing can make us suppose that unity has made any appreciable advance because of it. And this is so for the Council leaves to its member churches their autonomy; and consequently, it puts an end neither to their differences nor to their opposing positions.

The central problem with respect to Christian unity remains that which regards relations with Rome. As long as the World Council contents itself with bringing together Anglicans and Protestants, and, where it can, the Orthodox as well, it will only succeed in forming a bloc opposed to the Roman bloc. Yet the arraying of one bloc against the other is in no way ecumenical. In effect, the ecumenical movement, contrary to its original intention, has succeeded but in amalgamating the Protestant world. An effort has been made to win over the Orthodox, but union with them is even more difficult than with Catholics. In short, to speak of peace between the Churches is inevitably to return to the theme of peace with Rome. And peace with Rome would involve the peace of the whole world as well, for it is our divisions which undermine the preaching of the Gospel.

The New Testament acknowledges but one Church *alone*. Christ Himself prayed for unity, and St. Paul speaks only of the one Body of Christ. Unity therefore is of obligation.

---

[1] *Cf. Reformatio. Sonderheft Christ und Welfriede. Zweite schweizerische evangelische Akademikertagsung in Zürich. Friede unter den Kirchen,* von Peter Vogelsanger, pp. 679-719.

That which separates Rome from the children of the Protestant Reformation is precisely a different conception of unity and of the means towards its realization. The faith of the Roman Church on this point is clear and precise: it is she herself that is the one Church of Christ, and those Christians separated from the Apostolic See must return to Rome; this is the only way of attaining to Christian unity. The Church is not free to think otherwise. On the other hand, Protestants believe themselves bound by Holy Scripture, as they understand it, to repudiate Rome's teaching on this point. Thus it is that Dr. Vogelsanger comes to the core of the radical opposition that exists between that which is Catholic and that which is not: namely, the conception of the Church. For Catholics the Church is endowed with a visible unity, maintained by an infallible authority; while for Protestants she is vested with only a vague form of unity and is capable of falling into error.

In consequence of this, our lecturer, who is animated with a sincere desire for unity, arrives at the inevitable conclusion: the urgent task is to search out a theological agreement — an agreement in the same faith. Let no one say that it is too soon, that we must first of all look elsewhere for contacts, collaborate in works of Christian charity, or join in mutual combat against atheistic communism. Why be afraid to deal with the central problem? Instead of multiplying more or less solid and elegant bridges to span the chasm, fill in the chasm, and you will have no further need for bridges. This task is one that belongs to the theologians. It is for them to bring to light that which unites and that which divides. The truths held in common are today — after the decline of liberalism — of such capital importance that they should carry along in their wake agreement on other matters as well. When we confess together the Holy Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption, we are brothers in mind and heart, and we should no longer remain separated. Besides, we shall not all belong to the same Church until we all share in the same faith regarding the Church. The difficulty of Protestants, as Dr. Vogelsanger tells us, is that to their mind the Church for Catholics seems to take the place of Christ. Nevertheless, he adds, if one must make this difficulty known out of love for the truth, at the same time he must not despair of overcoming it.

As a matter of fact, one can already begin to see, both from the lecture given by Dr. Vogelsanger and from that of Dr. Albert Ebneter which followed, how that difficulty could be met. Protestants and Catholics possess the Bible in common. Now, in the New Testament there is at least one text in which Catholics see the mind of Christ with regard to His Church and in which Pro-

testants are also beginning to see it in the same light. The reader will already have understood that the reference is to the words of Jesus Christ to St. Peter: « Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church ». The French Protestant scholar, Dr. Oscar Cullmann, the German Luthèran, Henry Baumann, and now the Swiss Protestants, Vogelsanger and Ebneter, who even appeal to Karl Barth, are discarding the interpretations of the Protestant tradition and are recognizing that by the solemn declaration pronounced in the region near Caesarea Philippi, Christ was conferring on St. Peter a veritable primacy over the other Apostles and over the Church.

In this connection, Dr. Ebneter cites the sentence from Karl Barth: « We must in all tranquillity see and concede that in Matthew xvi, 18 ff., it is a question of an authority, of a power, and of an extraordinary calling, which are conferred most especially on Peter ». More and more the exegetes are in agreement in saying that it is indeed Jesus who gave to Simon the name (Peter). It is therefore Christ who established him as the foundation and the head of His Church. But this is a fact which carries everything before it, for it belongs to the character of the Catholic Church to have the successor of Peter as the permanent rock on which she is sustained. Her entire structure is derived from this property. One can therefore seize the sovereign importance involved in recognizing as coming from Christ a disposition which determines the entire constitution of the Church of Rome. The authors whom I have mentioned have only caught a glimpse of the possible consequences of their interpretation of the passage in question, but it seems to me that they have set out upon a way that leads to the full light of day.

Dr. Vogelsanger says that the announcement of the coming council made by Pope John XXIII has brought about an opening of minds and has prepared them for mutual discussion to a degree that heretofore seemed hardly possible. The understanding of the calling of St. Peter could also lead such an ecumenical dialogue to a result which still seems hardly possible; it could lead to Christian unity.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

PETER: THE SIGN OF UNITY

In a previous article we gave our consideration to God's design for unity as seen in the Catholic teaching concerning the Church. We saw that Christ established a very special kind of society, composed of men living in this world, and which St. Paul described as being in the likeness of a Body of which Christ is the Head, and the Holy Spirit the Soul. This society is the divine instrument which would enable all men in every age to share in the fruits of the Redemption, to become living members, as it were, of the very family of God, and so enter the kingdom of eternal glory. We also saw that one of the most outstanding characteristics of this Society is a divinely-given unity: all the members profess one and the same divine faith, and all the members form one and the same visible society throughout the world. It was Our Lord's will and command that this fold should extend itself to the very ends of the earth; it was His unconditional promise that this society would last until the end of the world.

Now we proceed further in our examination of God's design. We have said that Christ established a visible society on which He bestowed the note of Unity — a visible unity. On what basis is this statement made? In the first place, Our Lord chose personally and directly the first members of that society, who were visible men. Secondly, He commanded activities which were of their nature visible, say, preaching, baptizing, profession of faith, which are external actions: on the other hand, He commanded obedience to visible authorities: « He who hears you, hears Me ». « Whatever you shall bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven ». « Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ». These and other statements of the Saviour point to some visible spiritual authority which would derive its jurisdiction from Himself.

In confirmation of this, we have only to read the Acts of the Apostles to see that the Church was a visible society; we might also page through the Epistles to see the exercise of apostolic jurisdiction: concern for sound doctrine, care of souls, and so forth. St. Peter, for example, urges the members of the society: « Behave honorably among the pagans; that whereas they slander you as evildoers, they may, through observing you, by reason of your

good works glorify God on the day of visitation ». (I Pet. 2: 12) Such counsels are made to members of a visible organization; their personal lives and activities are manifest to other men.

In the conclusion of His sermon on the mount, Our Lord makes this observation: « Everyone therefore who hears these my words and acts upon them, shall be likened to a wise man who built his house on rock. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, but it did not fall, because it was founded on rock. And everyone who hears these my words and does not act upon them, shall be likened to a foolish man who built his house on sand. And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell, and was utterly ruined ». (Mt. 7: 24-27) Christ, being true God and true man and, consequently, infinitely wise, would follow this same procedure in any work He set Himself to do. Since He was about to establish a visible society which was to endure throughout all ages and which was to maintain its identity and unity throughout history, He would take those measures which would be most likely to secure it. We know that, on the divine level, the stability and unity of the Church would be sustained by the Holy Spirit inhabiting the Church as a Soul within a body and by Christ its Head. But, as its work is with men living in this world, the unity, stability, and identity of the Church must be in some way evident to the eyes of men. « That they all may be one ... that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me ».

So, if we are to look for Our Lord's design for unity, we must seek something which is objective, perpetual, and easily found. We say the design must be objective, that is, it must be completely independent of every human judgment; it is Christ's own determination that is sought. This must be discovered by study and with the help of grace, and everyone who does discover it will see exactly the same thing. We can see from the epistles of St. Paul that the faith was a treasured possession common to all and was to be transmitted by authorized teachers. Hence, it must be something objective.

We say also that Our Lord's design must be perpetual, that is, in its essential characteristics; it not only does not change, it cannot change. The new covenant was unconditional and perpetual; it was to last until the end of the world; no new arrangement is to follow it on this earth. « Let the wheat and tares grow together until the time of harvest ». « I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world ». « The gates of hell shall not prevail against it ». These and like solemn words were

used by the Saviour in unfolding His plan for the incorporation of the whole world into His one fold — into His Body, which is the Church. It is the only divinely sustained stable force in the world; it will outlive empires and civilizations until the day of judgment.

We say, too, that Our Lord's design must be easily found. The reason is that He willed the unity of His Church, « that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me ». It must be evident to the eyes of men. Moreover, as St. Paul said to King Agrippa, « These things were not done in a corner ». It is a fact of history, ascertainable from unimpeachable sources.

In a preceding article, we emphasized the close union between Christ and His Church, so close, in fact, that St. Paul used the name of Christ to signify the Church itself: He is the Head, the Church is His Body. The Church and Christ form, as it were, one thing. He shares His personal prerogatives with the Church, making it His instrument for the instruction and sanctification of mankind.

Let us at this point consider some of the personal prerogatives of Christ. In the first place, Scripture calls Him the *corner stone* of the Church. St. Paul writes: « You are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets with Christ Jesus Himself as the chief corner stone ». (Eph. 2: 20) The stability of the Church rests upon Christ as upon a foundation. In the second place, Scripture speaks of Christ as a *King* in the likeness of David. In the Apocalypse we read that He " ... has the key of David, he who opens and no one shuts, and who shuts and no one opens ". (Apoc. 3: 7) In antiquity the keys were very large. When they were carried, two keys were generally strapped together and hung over the right shoulder. The one who carried the keys was the master of the household. In Isaias we read: « A child is born to us and a king is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder ». (Is. 9: 16) He is speaking of the Messias who was about to come, and in the words « the government is upon his shoulder », we can see the suggestion of the keys which were the signs of his kingship.

In the third place, Our Lord calls Himself the *Good Shepherd.* (John, 10: 14) and refers to His Church as a flock. This is but another way of saying that He is the leader, protector, and ruler of His Church. Finally, to quote St. Paul, He is the source of strength: « So then, brethren, stand firm, and hold the teachings that you have learned, whether by word or by letter of ours. And may Our Lord Jesus Christ Himself and God Our Father ... comfort and strengthen your hearts in every good work and word ». (II Thess. 2: 15-17).

These are some of the personal prerogatives of Our Lord;

He is the Head, the Corner Stone, the Bearer of the keys, the Good Shepherd, the Strengthener. He solemnly declared that He was to be with His Church until the very consummation of the world. We know that He guides and strengthens it with an unseen hand; but, as we have said, the world must see the oneness of His Church in some visible manner. How is this effected?

To find this out, we should read all the Gospels from one end to the other as a whole. The plan of the Son of God became gradually clearer and more definite. In the beginning of His public life, He met those who were to be His first followers on the shores of the Jordan. To one of them He said: « Thou art Simon, the son of John; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter ». (Jn. 1: 42) This was a divinely-given name. Very rarely did such a thing ever take place in history. For example, God chose a man called Abram to be the father of the family of God in the Old Testament: « ... you shall no longer be called Abram, but your name shall be Abraham; for I will make you a father of a multitude of nations ». (Gen. 17: 5) The change of name indicated a special place in the plans of God, suggested in the name itself; the world Abraham means father of many nations. So, here in the case of Peter, we find something similar: « Thou shalt be called Cephas, which is interpreted Peter ». The word Peter means Rock. Our Lord made no further specification at that time.

It was some time later that Our Lord raised the question in the midst of His Apostles: « 'But who do you say that I am?' Simon Peter answered and said: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God'. Then Jesus answered and said: 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this to thee, but My Father in heaven. And I say to thee: thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven' ». (Mt. 16: 15-19) Here we see the specification of the meaning of the change of name from Simon to Peter. Our Lord is making Peter the foundation stone of His Church. How can this be? Is not Christ Himself the corner stone upon which the Church is built? Of course, He is the foundation of the Church and will remain so forever. But that we may have no doubt of His plan, He freely and solemnly bestows on Simon His own personal title, « the Rock ». And to make it clearer, He goes further and says: « I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven ». We have seen that the bearer of the keys is the head of the household. Here our Lord is telling Peter that he,

Peter, will, at some future date, hold the keys which are now in Christ's own possession, so that when He withdraws His visible presence from their midst, Peter will assume His place in the visible Society of His followers on earth: « Whatever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven ».

Now we transfer the scene to that of Our Lord's Last Supper. At that solemn hour, His prayer « That they all may be one » was made. In St. Luke's account of it, we find the following incident: « Now there arose a dispute among them, which of them was reputed to be the greatest. But He said to them 'The kings of the gentiles lord it over them, and they who exercise authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you. On the contrary, let him who is greatest among you become as the youngest, and him who is the chief as the servant ... But I am in your midst as one who serves'. ... And the Lord said: 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith may not fail; and do thou, when once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren' ». (Luke 22: 24-32) The human frailties of the apostles made themselves evident in their contention for pride of place. Our Lord settles their question. He says explicitly that there will be one among them who will be the chief, but He counsels humility, that even as He, who is the Head of the band, stood as one who serves, whoever takes His place should do likewise. Then, turning to one of them, Simon, He says: « Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat ». It is important to note the fact that the « you » is plural; He is referring, not to Peter alone, but to all, that the powers of hell would seek to divide His Church. He now gives His design for unity: « ... But I have prayed for *thee* (singular) that *thy* faith may not fail; and do *thou*, once thou hast turned again, strengthen thy brethren ». Here the same note is sounded again. Peter, the rock, is to be the strengthener of the brethren. It is to be kept in mind that this was done on the same occasion as that on which Our Lord prayed for unity; a prayer which could not fail of its proper effect.

After His resurrection, Our Lord met with His apostles on the shore of the lake of Tiberias. St. John reports the event as follows: « When, therefore, they had breakfasted, Jesus said to Simon Peter: 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love me more than these do?' He said to Him: 'Yes, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee'. He said to him: 'Feed my lambs'. He said to him a second time: 'Simon, son of John, dost thou love me?' Peter was grieved because He said to him, for the third time, 'Dost thou love me?' and he said to Him: 'Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou

knowest that I love Thee'. He said to him: 'Feed my sheep'. 'Amen, amen, I say to thee, when thou wast young thou didst gird thyself and walk where thou wouldst. But when thou art old thou wilt stretch forth thy hands, and another will gird thee, and lead thee where thou wouldst not'. Now this he said to signify by what manner of death he should glorify God. And having spoken thus, He said to him: 'Follow me'. Turning around, Peter saw following them the disciple whom Jesus loved ... Peter, therefore, seeing him, said to Jesus: 'Lord, and what of this man?' Jesus said to him: 'If I wish him to remain until I come, what is it to thee? Do thou follow me'». (Jn. 21: 15-22).

As we mentioned before, Our Lord called Himself the Good Shepherd — a proper and distinctive title belonging to Himself. Now, in the most solemn manner, He bestows the same title on Peter. « Feed my lambs ». The word translated as « feed » means: « Be thou the shepherd of my lambs ». This is clear from the context: « Follow thou me », that is, « Take my place ». In some important manuscripts of the Greek Testament, three distinct words are used for the flock: lambs, yearlings, sheep, thus showing a gradation in the flock, the whole of which looks to Peter as to its shepherd. Does Christ hand over the sheep to Peter and thereby surrender completely His title as the Good Shepherd? Obviously not. He said: « Feed *my* lambs ... Feed *my* yearlings ... Feed *my* sheep ». We can see that Our Lord retains the title of ownership of the flock (*my* lambs), but, as He was about to withdraw His visible presence from their midst, He would not leave them orphans, but provided one who would take His place.

We see, then, that Christ bestowed His own personal titles on Peter; He who is the foundation stone of the Church, constituted Peter the Rock upon which He would build it; He who holds the keys of supreme government, gives the earthly exercise of His jurisdiction to Peter; He who was the strength of the apostles, makes Peter the confirmer of the brethren; He who is the Good Shepherd, commits His sheep to the care of Peter. Are there then two Heads of the Church? Not at all: Christ remains the Head of the Church. He holds these titles by His own proper right, while Peter shares those titles by virtue of a divine commission. Hence, we say that Peter was the vicar of Christ. « Feed *my* lambs ». The flock is Our Lord's personal property; Peter fills His place with respect to that same flock here on earth. At His Last Supper, Christ prayed: « That they all may be one ... That the world may believe that Thou has sent Me ». The unity and identity of His Church must be evident to the world in some visible way, and He, as a wise builder, chose Peter for this purpose.

It is important to keep in mind that the choice of Peter was a deliberate determination of the Son of God Himself. This was done independently of Peter's personal qualities. For example, on the very occasion when Christ declared him to be the rock upon which He would build His Church, Peter showed his human limitations, and Our Lord said to him: « Get thee behind Me Satan, for thou art a scandal to Me ». At the Last Supper, when he was told that he would be the confirmer of the brethren, Our Lord predicted that he would deny Him. The glorious prerogatives and the human frailty of Peter are put together in the same context in close conjunction with each other. Christ wishes to teach us, it would seem, that in his human capacity Peter may fail because he is a mortal man, but when assisted in his office by the eternal Father, his prerogatives as vicar of Jesus Christ remain. Our Lord was well aware of His man when He chose him and gave him the opportunity of wiping out his threefold denial by the threefold declaration of his love. Of one thing we can be sure; the strength which Peter showed afterwards, culminating in a crucifixion in imitation of His Lord, should be attributed, not to natural endowments, but to divinely-given strength. Christ, the rock, rendered Peter firm; Christ, the shepherd, made Peter the vicar of His love.

This is the Catholic picture of God's design for His Church. We say, too, that this design is to last as long as the Church itself lasts. And why? « Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it ». What is referred to in this instance — the Church, or the Rock upon which it is built? It can be either. The foundation stone lasts as long as the building it supports; if the building is to last until the very consummation of the world, the foundation will always be there to support it.

Perhaps our consideration of this theme could be concluded in no better way than by quoting a splendid prayer of the Byzantine rite from its office for June 29: « Thou justly art called the Rock; when the Lord made secure the unshakeable faith of His Church, He constituted thee the chief shepherd of His spiritual sheep; moreover, He gave thee the commission as a good key-bearer of the heavenly gates to open to all who keep knocking at them with faith. With good reason then thou wert deemed worthy to be crucified, as thy Master. Beseech Him to save and enlighten our souls, thou who art Christ's Herald, bearing the boast and glory of the cross. Christ, the Rock, through thee, Peter, Prince of the Apostles, has founded His Church unshaken, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail ... Deliver her then from trials and dangers by thy prayers, most blessed one ».

EDWARD HANAHOE, S. A.

THE FUTURE OF THE FAITH AND ORDER COMMISSION OF THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

The World Council of Churches represents and embodies a *movement*. Now to judge a movement demands knowledge of the *terminus a quo* and of the *terminus ad quem*. I must confess that I feel lamentably ignorant of the *terminus a quo*, which is the actual state of the non-Catholic Christians in the world. One respected leader of the Faith and Order Commission said to me: 'You must remember that we must unite not only theological systems but also living men and women. The problem is largely to get the ordinary members of churches to see the vision and to be carried along with us'.

Consequently, I give only 'impressions', indicating in general on what they are based.

1. Many, indeed I think all, are determined on doctrinal unity, and on orthodox doctrinal unity. This was apparent in the 'expansion' of the Basis of the WCC to be explicitly trinitarian, and in the addition in the Faith and Order Report of the words 'holding the one apostolic faith'. But it was evident, also, in many addresses given at the St Andrews meetings. There are, of course, differences as to what precisely is, in all details, 'the apostolic faith' and it is to resolve these that the WCC exists. But there was equal determination to give not the slightest ground for suggestions of 'doctrinal relativism' or anything approaching 'unorthodoxy'.

2. There was a general agreement that the present measure of 'cooperation' and of general good feeling may become an obstacle to real unity, or, as Archbishop Fisher once expressed it, that the ecumenical movement might develop rather into a narcotic than a stimulant; and as Dr Visser 't Hooft put it, that our divisions might seem less deplorable because they have an ecumenical varnish.

It is, of course, easier to describe this danger than to overcome it; but the Report on the Future of Faith and Order at least made a challenging effort towards overcoming it.

3. There was general agreement on the need to carry the outlooks attained by the leaders down to the 'local' level. Hence plans are developing for stronger 'councils' not only at the regional

and national level, but also at the 'local' level, that is, in cities, towns and areas.

4. Except for matters of procedure, v. g. what committee is to be set up and what are its precise functions, the idea of majority opinion prevailing is strongly rejected. There must be universal agreement, as far as this is humanly possible. No minority must be over-ruled, and this refers to the Orthodox on the one wing and the churches of a 'congregationalist' polity on the other. Reports are 'accepted' by the Commission only in the sense that they are sent out to the churches for consideration and comment.

5. At St Andrews there was a sense of urgency in the task of attaining visible unity, an urgency accentuated by the Youth Report and by the remarks of several members of the Younger Churches. It had been said, for instance, that the Faith and Order Commission was stagnating, and that 'the theologians go round in circles'. The Report on the Future of Faith and Order tried to meet this feeling.

6. The Faith and Order Commission for the last four years had been representing that its place in the organization of the Council ought to be most important and ought to be easily seen to be most important. In order to bring this about, at St Andrews it was planned that the Faith and Order Commission should be increased in number of members from 100 to 120 (including consultants), that its Secretariat should be increased, that its budget should rise from $ 18,225 to $ 42,000, that its Director should be a member of the 'Staff Executive Group', that it should meet every two years instead of every three (or that other arrangements be developed to strengthen the regular operation of the Commission), and that there should be a World Conference of Faith and Order in 1963.

It was represented, however, that all the other departments and organs of the World Council have the unity of the Church as their aim, even if some work only indirectly towards it. Many Reports, v. g. on the Laity, on Evangelism, on Missionary Studies, and even on relations with the United Nations and governments, made explicit mention of their sense of the need of theological principles and doctrine.

7. The Sub-Committee of Faith and Order on Regional and National Developments said this about the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity:

> 'We are convinced that the work of Faith and Order will find its foundation in prayer. Therefore the committee suggests:

'*a*) that the Week of Prayer for Christian Unity be provided with additional popular and promotional literature where appropriate.

'*b*) that interconfessional Bible study be undertaken in connection with this Week.

'*c*) that ecumenical retreats and schools of prayer might be features of this Week.

'*d*) that all material for the observance be made available not later than half a year before, so that adequate promotion can take place'.

The Basis of the WCC

Since its formation in 1948, the WCC has admitted as members only churches which 'accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour'.

In 1954, the Church of Norway requested that the words 'according to the Holy Scriptures' should be added. A suggestion that the Basis should be explicitly trinitarian had been advanced by influential members of the Orthodox Churches and also from other quarters, including the General Council of the Congregational Christian Churches of the U.S.A. A special committee was set up, which in 1959 suggested the following expansion:

> 'The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which, in accordance with Holy Scripture, confess our Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God who was made man for our salvation, in whom the Father was revealed, and to whom the Holy Spirit bears witness guiding us into all truth'.

At the St Andrews meeting in 1960 this formula was changed to read as follows:

> '... which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit'.

Before this expansion of the Basis was accepted by the Central Committee, consideration was given to the nature of the Basis; and it was agreed that it has never been thought of as a creed, nor as offering a full statement of the Christian faith. Its one and only purpose is, in the words of the General Secretary, 'to say

what holds us together in the World Council, what is the starting point of our conversation and the foundation of our collaboration '. The Central Committee said that it believes that this expansion ' does no more than make explicit what has all along been implicit in the present Basis, but that it meets the general desire to include a reference to the Scriptures and to the Three Persons of the Undivided Trinity '.

The Report on the Future of Faith and Order

The Report submitted in 1958 began with ' a scrutiny and re-assessment of our « functions » as set out in the Constitution of Faith and Order '. But in 1959 three paragraphs were premised to this scrutiny and re-assessment, which, after what the Press release called ' lively discussion on Faith and Order Report ', were emended to read as follows:

> ' The Faith and Order movement was born in the hope that it would be, under God, a help to the churches in realizing His will for the unity of the Church. The formation of the World Council of Churches, and the incorporation of Faith and Order in it, have changed the circumstances under which Faith and Order works, but have not changed its purpose.
>
> ' The Commission on Faith and Order understands that the unity which is both God's will and His gift to His Church is one which brings all in each place[1] who confess Christ Jesus as Lord into a fully committed fellowship with one another through one baptism into Him, holding the one apostolic faith, preaching the one Gospel and breaking the one bread, and having a corporate life reaching out in witness and service to all; and which at the same time unites them with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and members are acknowledged by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls the Church.
>
> ' It is for such unity that we believe we must pray and work. Such a vision has indeed been the inspiration of the Faith and Order movement in the past, and we re-affirm that this is still our goal. We recognize that the brief description

[1] The word « place » here is used both in its primary sense of local neighbourhood and also, under more modern conditions, of other areas in which Christians need to express unity in Christ, e. g. all those engaged in local industry.

of our objective leaves many questions unanswered. In particular we would state emphatically that the unity we seek is not one of uniformity, nor a monolithic power structure, and that on the interpretation and the means of achieving certain of the matters specified we are not yet of a common mind. The achievement of unity will involve nothing less than a death and re-birth for many forms of church life as we have known them. We believe that nothing less costly can finally suffice '.

The Report then considers each of the functions set out in the Constitution of Faith and Order.

(i) ' To proclaim the essential oneness of the Church of Christ and to keep prominently before the Council and the Churches the obligation to manifest that unity and its urgency for the work of evangelism '.

' It is our strong conviction that to proclaim the essential oneness of the Church means facing the question: « What kind of unity does God demand of His Church? » We agree that no one definition of the nature of unity can be a condition of membership in the WCC, but Faith and Order exists in order to stand for the unity of the Church as the will of God and for a ceaseless effort to know what obedience to that will means concretely. Only so can it be « manifest ». The WCC can have no « neutrality » on whether that question is answered or not.

' Clearly the World Council is not in a position to say what the answer is in all its fullness; if it were, our quest for the « manifest unity » would already be at an end. As the Toronto Statement of 1950 put it: « As the conversation between the Churches develops, and as the Churches enter into closer contact with each other, they will no doubt have to face new decisions and problems. For the Council exists in order the break the deadlock between the Churches ». *All* the churches in the Council confront each other under the demand of God Himself that they should learn from Him the nature of the unity which we seek. It has been characteristic of Faith and Order to recognize that patience and thoroughness are needed for this task. But it is also necessary to recognize that in such matters we are not entirely free to proceed at our own pace, that events are forcing upon us various kinds of Christian co-operation, and that if we do not find true unity we shall find ourselves remaining content

with a form of organizational unity which leaves unfulfilled many of the central requirements of the Church's life. There is therefore need for a proper sense of urgency lest we lose the time that God gives us. Faith and Order must constantly press upon the Council and the churches the fact that the question of unity is one upon which an answer has to be given, and that to give no answer means to be shut up to the wrong answer '.

The Report then says that Faith and Order must raise this question in Assemblies, with the Central Committee and the Commissions; and suggests that the WCC secretariat should from time to time ask departments how far they are contributing to the fullness of unity. National and regional Councils should be asked whether their work provides for Faith and Order, ' so that this connection may be brought home in every region '.

' As our churches seek to obey God in the renewal of their confessional and liturgical life, and in promoting its mission, they will be deaf to what God is saying to them in our day, if they do not, constantly and specifically, seek His guidance in how to translate all aspects of renewal and mission into manifestations of greater and growing unity.

' Finally, in all this we must bring home the truth that our present differences and divisions hinder the mission and renewal of the Church and may obscure, even if they do not actually contradict, the Gospel of reconciliation '.

(ii) ' To study questions of faith, order and worship with the relevant social, cultural, political, racial and other factors in their bearing on the unity of the Church '.

To quote the Report in full would take too much space. To give an inadequate summary, the general bearing was to try to make the studies and insights of Faith and Order ' penetrate into the life of the churches ' and not remain hidden in archives. Long-term co-operative study was part of the role of Faith and Order, but the communication of the results of these studies presented difficulties. The following were the suggestions: Special World and regional Conferences of Faith and Order; conferences of smaller groups; contact with the churches by staff visitation and correspondence and by careful dissemination of published material, both direct and through the churches and national councils; ' field research ', short *ad hoc* conferences, regional enquiries on specific issues, pilot-experiments in local groups, provision for theological

faculties to pay attention to Faith and Order issues, consultation by other departments with Faith and Order so that the relation of unity to other discussions might be made plain.

> (iii)' To study the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement '.

The Report on this point referred to ' the theological interpretation of such a fact as the WCC itself which, though it is not the Church, is certainly not unrelated to the Church and contains its own significance as a form of Christian unity which needs to be kept under theological scrutiny. The work begun by the Central Committee at Toronto in 1950 initiated a process which Faith and Order should feel a special responsibility to continue and to extend, for the sake both of those within the WCC and those beyond its membership '.

Behind this brief remark lie, I think, two contradictory interpretations of the present state of the WCC: a) that it is becoming an agency for academic study and for cooperation in good works, including fostering missions; and b) that it is becoming ' a Super-Church ', that is, a bureaucratic institution which lessens the independence of the member churches. I think Dr. Visser ' t Hooft said that it would be far too easy a solution to say that these two charges cancel one another out. Dr. Lesslie Newbigin, former Bishop of South India, has called attention to the theological implications of the existence of the World Council, saying that it is ' a form of togetherness in Christ ' and hence needs careful scrutiny.

The Toronto Statement declared that ' no Church is obliged to change its ecclesiology as a consequence of membership in the World Council ' (III, n. 3) It also declared that ' the Council exists in order to break the deadlock between the Churches '. Fears have been expressed lest the first of these declarations should result in stagnation and the churches be left as they are, satisfied with mere cooperation; and, on the other hand, lest the attempt to ' break the deadlock ' should in some way infringe upon the autonomy of churches. Some members of the WCC would seem to consider the one fear more important than the other.

Many churches cling most tenaciously to the theory of the absolute autonomy of the local congregation and are suspicious of any organization or action which seems to lessen the viability of that theory. This may be appreciated from reading Paul M. Harrison's *Authority and Power in the Free Church Tradition, A Social Case Study of the American Baptist Convention* (Princeton,1959). During one of the sessions of the St Andrews meetings,

Dr E. A. Payne, a prominent English Baptist, referred to this book and expressed regretful reservations about it, and a reader even superficially acquainted with Baptist history and practice would agree, I think, with Dr Payne's reservations. At the same time, the book gives an illustration of the actual situation with which the WCC has to deal, and of the fierce sense of independence among members of many churches, perhaps especially, though by no means exclusively, in North America. One may say, I think, that the first paragraphs of the Faith and Order Report are somewhat of a challenge to the churches and their members, but that it does not go beyond the Statement of Toronto, since the Report merely outlines what the present members of the Faith and Order Commission understand as the ultimate goal of the movement.

> (iv) ' To study matters in the present relationships of the Churches to one another which cause difficulties and need theological clarification '.

This refers mainly to ' proselytism ' in all its bearings. This subject was studied by a special committee, in which Dr Angus Dun was a leader, and the document of a provisional nature issued in 1956 has been revised and was accepted at the St Andrews meetings. It will doubtless receive full consideration in later issues of *Unitas* and elsewhere. In passing ,the provisional report (fifth draft) of the committee on religious liberty was referred back for further study partly on the ground that ' some theological problems involved should receive fuller treatment '. What these problems are was not specified.

> (v) ' To provide information concerning actual steps taken by the Churches towards reunion '.

The Report stresses the value of this service, but adds that it could be done more effectively if greater resources of staff were available.

The second part of the Report deals with further implications of the work of the Faith and Order Commission under three heads: (1) Unity negotiations; (2) Regional conferences;and (3) relations with Christians outside the WCC membership.

(1) As regards unity negotiations, the Report suggests that the Faith and Order Commission might help more by providing for consultations (one of which was held at St Andrews in which, among other matters, the legal aspect of unity of church bodies was discussed); by analyzing proposals for reunion, by fostering meet-

ings of diverse kinds and by designating consultants at reunion negotiations, if the churches concerned requested them.

All this, however, is to be governed by the constitutional provision which reads as follows:

> ' Only churches themselves are competent to take actual steps towards reunion by entering into negotiations with one another. The work of the movement is not to formulate schemes and tell the churches what they are to do, but to act as the handmaid of the churches in the preparatory work of clearing away misunderstandings, discussing obstacles to reunion, and issuing reports which are submitted to the churches for their consideration '.

(2) Regional conferences held in New Zealand and at Oberlin, Ohio, appear to have had fruitful results; reference was also made to the Indian regional conference, to an African Christian conference and to the Lutheran-Reformed meetings. The Faith and Order Commission is empowered to encourage all such enterprises; and its relations with national councils of churches suggest that the Commission might indicate ' pilot-schemes ' of study and ' dialogue '.

(3) Relations with Christians outside the WCC membership.

The Report says that a basic principle is to try to draw churches out of isolation; and notes that ' we are empowered to invite representatives of such churches to serve in our Commission, and so, by implication, on our Theological Commissions '.

> ' We have in mind two groups among those who « accept Our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour ».
>
> (a) *The Roman Catholic Church* constitutes so large a part of Christendom that we are bound to take it into consideration in our work for Christian unity. But we realize the very serious difficulties which arise, both from their side and from ours, to hinder any official or clearly defined relationship. Yet Faith and Order is an aspect of the WCC in which the Roman Catholic Church has shown an interest. Roman Catholic theologians have made important contributions by their writings to the discussion of Faith and Order issues. We believe that this theological discussion should be pursued in whatever ways may be mutually acceptable.
>
> (b) *Protestant Churches* outside the WCC need another form of approach, for as compared with the unity (though complex) of the Roman Catholic Church, we are here dealing with very diverse entities. But we believe that many of them

are ready to enter into common study with the WCC and to meet in personal contact in various countries and regions. They comprise another group of fellow Christians with whom Faith and Order should enter into fellowship on the ground of common concern for Christian mission and unity .

With regard to them both, we would urge that Faith and Order should:

(i) aim at a situation in the WCC staff which ensured that there should always be people sufficiently free from other commitments to make it a first charge on their time to be in continuous, personal, and well-informed contact with the whole complexity of both these groups;

(ii) on the basis of such contact, the Faith and Order Secretariat, Working Committee and other groups in Faith and Order would be in a position to be kept informed of developments and openings, and so be able to seek their participation in our theological work where it was then deemed possible and advisable '.

The last section of the Report deals with ' Consequences for Organization '. The main principle here was enunciated: ' Faith and Order should be clearly seen to occupy a place in the structure of the WCC which properly reflects its central and fundamental role in the whole ecumenical movement '.

There were different opinions as to the way in which this could best be brought about. Some thought that Faith and Order should be made a distinct Division; but the Procedure and Finance Committee thought that this was not practicable ' at the present state in the light of the total situation in the WCC ' and recommended that Faith and Order remain within the Division of Studies. With this suggestion the Faith and Order Commission said ' we concur at this time, though we believe that the location of Faith and Order within the Study Division is not the best final solution to our problem '. But the Faith and Order Commission expressed gratefulness for the proposed generous increase in the budget, and believed that this would go far to make possible ' other arrangements to strengthen the regular operation of the Commission '.

Suggestions were made that the Director of Faith and Order be named ' Theological Secretary of the WCC ', a suggestion ultimately rejected by the Faith and Order Commission. A proposal was made that there should be in Faith and Order a Director of the Commission, an Executive Secretary and a Research Secretary; this, however, was not pursued and the details of expansion of the Commission were left to be worked out in further conference.

The concrete results of this discussion have been outlined in this article under (6). The following statement about the position of the Director of Faith and Order was approved by the Central Committee:

> 'The Director of Faith and Order should also be fully involved in the total work of the WCC, since concern for unity pervades all the parts. Thus he should be in the closest relationship to the General Secretariat through membership in the Staff Executive group, in which the General Secretary takes counsel with the Associate General Secretaries and the Directors of Finance and of Information on all matters of overall strategy at staff level. Here he would be responsible for bringing the concerns of Faith and Order to bear upon the total programme of the Council, for forwarding the study of the theological implications of the existence of the ecumenical movement and for correlating all studies and functions in any unit of the Council which specifically relate to Church union'.

In net result, then, it seems fair to say that the Faith and Order Commission has obtained more men, more money, more Conferences, including a World Conference, more dissemination of its insights, and a stronger and more central position for its Director.

What Kind of Unity?

The Report of Faith and Order is to be considered by the Assembly in New Delhi. Perhaps the most significant part of the Report is contained in the paragraph defining the goal of the movement, and I cite it again:

> 'The Commission on Faith and Order understands that the unity which is both God's will and His gift to His Church is one which brings all in each place who confess Christ Jesus as Lord into a fully committed fellowship with one another through one baptism into Him, holding the one apostolic faith, preaching the one Gospel and breaking the one bread, and having a corporate life reaching out in witness and service to all; and which at the same time unites them with the whole Christian fellowship in all places and all ages in such wise that ministry and membres are acknowledged by all, and that all can act and speak together as occasion requires for the tasks to which God calls the Church'.

In the original draft this unity was named 'churchly' unity; but as the world 'churchly' might be confused with the word 'churchy', especially in translations, the word was dropped. As a result of the discussion in Faith and Order, the expression 'holding the one apostolic faith' was added, even though the expression 'preaching the one Gospel' might conceivably be regarded as implicitly including this; it was added to lay greater emphasis on the importance of agreement in faith.

'In view of the importance of the question raised by the proposal of Faith and Order', said Professor Henri d'Espine, in addressing the Central Committee, 'the General Secretary asked the advice of 53 people who were particularly competent and representative of our different churches. In my opinion the answers given by the 30 replies received can be summed up as follows: ... the objective as described in the second paragraph was approved by the great majority of the writers, either because they considered that this was the conception of unity which Faith and Order always had in mind, or because they saw in it a normal development of views which were only sketched out earlier. The argument most frequently advanced in favour of approval is that this conception has the merit of ruling out as insufficient a unity which is merely federal and cooperative, and prevents us from being content with the kind of unity which the World Council itself represents at present. It is significant that none of the correspondents took upon himself to defend either a purely « spiritual » unity or a « federal » unity'.

The first two parts of the Faith and Order Report are to be submitted to the Assembly in Nov.-Dec., 1961, at New Delhi.

Interim accounts were given to the Faith and Order Commission of the studies proceeding on Christ and the Church, (which includes study on Baptism), Tradition and Traditions, Institutionalism and Ways of Worship; these show, I think, that serious work is going on and that there are new insights which tend to make some of the older 'denominational' outlooks obsolete or irrelevant. But to discuss these *interim* reports would demand far more space than is here available.

Perhaps the Orthodox Bishop John of San Francisco summed up the situation in the shortest address (in Russian) given at the St Andrews meetings:

'We are making progress, and progress in the right direction'.

BERNARD LEEMING, S. J.

Heythrop College, Oxon.

A SUPERNATURAL APOSTOLATE

Ecumenical activities abound in the confused world of today. They are astonishing for their vigor as they are for the multiplicity of their modes, aims, and ideologies. To some they give reason for joyful hope, and to others for trouble and anxiety. However the well intended ferment may be best assessed, good expectations are warranted since the Son of God asked for unity in the faith He had brought to us, and to the petition joined His Sacrifice.

The prayer He once addressed to His Father, when the Last Supper was ended, has not altogether come to an end. Christ continues to pray in His Mystical Body, and His supplication for unity may be recognized in the supreme sacrifice of the Trappistine Maria Gabriella, one of a number who have consecrated themselves wholly to the fulfilment of the prayer « *ut omnes unum sint* ». Another is the Capuchin Father, Leopold of Castronovo, who died in 1942 in the odor of sanctity.

Fr. Leopold had been thwarted in his early ambition to carry out an apostolate of unity among those of the separated Eastern Churches. Through circumstances designed or permitted by Providence, and in response to the urging of the Spirit who blows where He will, be turned all the powers of His soul upon the unseen Christ and identified Himself so perfectly with the sacrificing and sacrificed Son of Mary that he became a potently efficacious apostle to his brethren of the East while living quietly in his Friary at Padua.

He has been declared a Servant of God, and has become known and venerated in many nations, but principally as shepherd of his penitents' souls in the Confessional. Actually his priestly ministry extended beyond the faithful kneeling before him, and embraced the millions of separated Slavic peoples, and other Eastern Christians whose separation from the See of Peter is a source of grief to Christ and His Holy Mother.

This year the Capuchin Fathers have published a pamphlet for the purpose of furthering the cause of Fr. Leopold's glorification [1]. It contains a series of statements written in his own hand,

---

[1] P. Bernardinus a Senis, Postulator Generalis O. F. M. Cap., *Servus Dei P. Leopoldus a Castronovo Capuccinus et Dissidentium Reditus ad Ecclesiam Catholicam;* Romae, Cura Postulationis Generalis O. F. M. Cap., 1960.

and which he intended solely for his own eyes. The brief sentences were usually jotted down on holy-cards, doubtless for the purpose of reinforcing his will, « in view of human frailty », to spend the entirety of his forces in the God-given apostolate of drawing his separated brethren back to unity.

These expressions, composed under the urge of his more intense ardors, report the views of a human soul finely attuned to the desires of the Divine Master. Since they could serve his fellow-workers as a guide in straightening out their own paths to the goal they hold in common with him, some of the more pertinent passages are presented below.

First, we shall introduce Fr. Leopold as a Croatian, born at Castronovo in the Diocese of Cattaro in 1886. He came to Italy at the age of eighteen to study for the priesthood with the Capuchins at Udine. After dwelling in various Italian houses of the Province, he was assigned to the Friary at Padua in 1906, and remained there exercising his priestly ministry to the end of his life.

He had become aware of a distinct calling from God to labor for the return of his dissident compatriots while still a boy, and had envisaged an active apostolate among the Slavic peoples. After he had become a Franciscan Friar, he became aware of a more precise mission. It was to be a hidden apostolate, elevated to and limited to the supernatural spheres of activity.

He writes clearly of a mission given him by God:

« I, Brother Leopold, today (before 6 A.M.) have understood the plan of divine grace: I have been called to the salvation of my people, that is the Slavonic people ».

It is a double mission, for he remains wholly dedicated to the care of souls at Padua:

« ... I have been called to the salvation of souls, especially through the administration of the Sacrament of Penance; wherefore, with all doubt set aside, I must make every effort to use the office bestowed upon me, and everywhere, to the fullest extent of my powers, with the grace of God helping me in all things, fulfill this my double mission: namely, and first and foremost, the salvation of my people, and then the care of the souls of the faithful through the Sacrament of Penance ».

The calling originates with God:

« ... the will itself, the desire itself, of greater or lesser ardor, for obtaining this good is itself a divine vocation which He deigned to bestow upon me ... ».

He writes clearly and emphatically a year before his death of a mission that includes not only his Croatian compatriots, but all separated Orientals:

« Before God: no further doubt remains for me. By reason of my priestly, Seraphic vocation, I am chosen for the salvation of the Oriental people, that is, of the dissident Orientals. Wherefore, I must respond to the divine goodness of Our Lord Jesus Christ, who deigned to choose me, so that even through me, my ministry should accomplish something of that divine promise: There will be one fold and one Shepherd ».

He signifies that his vocation was received in the year 1887, since in 1937 he writes:

« This is the fiftieth anniversary of the year in which for the first time I heard the voice of God calling, and which called me to pray, and to promote the return of the dissident Orientals to Catholic Unity ».

In the will to consecrate himself totally to the accomplishment of his mission, he bound himself under vow. He repeated the vow frequently, at times more than once a day. It is not clear when he first pronounced it, but it would have been during the first years of his life as a religious. The form in which he makes the vow shows all the activities of his soul converging upon the Sacrifice of the Mass:

« In homage to, and for the service of the Co-redemptrix of the human race, the Blessed Virgin Mary.

« I bind myself under vow: Whenever I celebrate Mass (Sacrum sum facturus), if I am not previously engaged by justice or piety, the whole fruit of the Holy Sacrifice will be for the return of the dissident Orientals to Catholic Unity. When, however, I shall be persuaded otherwise by justice or piety, then with justice and piety safeguarded, all fruit remaining over and above will be for this same end.

« Furthermore, all other intentions of my life will be in union with the same Holy Sacrifice for their return, as stated above, directly, really, and with all diligence, the reason (of a binding vow) being my human frailty.

« I declare the end of my life to be the return of the dissident Orientals to Catholic Unity. Let there be one fold and one Shepherd ».

Echoing the words of St. Paul on the formidable mystery of suffering, Fr. Leopold willingly assumes the sufferings of Christ's Passion as they are perpetuated in the members of His Mystical Body:

« According to the example of divine charity, that is to say: so as to serve Christ Jesus, and His Virgin Mother more and more generously, before God, I bind myself under oath by a vow to the

fulfilment of those things which are lacking to the debt of suffering with regard to the separated Orientals ».

So generously did he long to fulfill the vow that his notes report to us: « I wish to write my vows in my own blood; O Blessed Virgin, may my desire be acceptable to thee ».

It would seem that his zeal was never satisfied, and that for his affections, the utmost was never more than little. He made the greatest offering possible:

« Before God I write: because of the grace conceded me, I again renew my vows, and I present myself as a victim for the Redemption of my brethren through the unbloody Sacrifice of Christ which I offer daily to God on the holy altar. May all things be for salvation and prosperity ... ».

In response to this heroic offering, he was visited with torments of both spirit and body. He suffered ailments of the stomach; they were toward the end recognized as cancer which extended into the esophagus. Any priest who has the habit of the confessional will understand the trying burden he shouldered by remaining at the disposition of his penitents from twelve to fifteen hours each day during the extreme cold of winter and the insufferable heat of the summer season. He would not add to his brief hours of rest—he must use the time praying for his penitents. Nor would he shorten his duties in the confessional, since he must expiate for the sins of others. His own confessor informs us that he underwent agonies of spiritual torment at the end of his life through periods of aridity and sorrow, to which, however, his childlike confidence in God's mercy never succumbed.

Yet another affliction gave him occasion for still greater sacrifice: he was witheld from going personally to the Orient to carry out the mission upon which his whole heart was bent. His superiors at Padua at one time asigned him to the Friary at Fiume. Greatly elated, he descended immediately to the church to thank God for the great blessing of approaching nearer to his Orient. Then the assignment was withdrawn because the Bishop of Padua, Mons. Elia Dalla Costa, since become Cardinal Archbishop of Florence, insisted upon his desire that Fr. Leopold remain at Padua. The Servant of God accepted the blow with a prompt and obedient spirit. From that time, the arduously devoted care of his penitents became in a mystical way his Oriental apostolate. In his words:

« ... for which reason, each soul who shall ask my ministry, will meanwhile be my Orient ».

At another writing:

« In homage to the Divine Heart of the Divine Shepherd; in homage to the Most Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of the same Divine

Pastor, that is, the Co-redemptrix of the human race: I bind myself under vow with all diligence, because of my frailty, according to the manner of my resolution, to devote all the actions of my life to the return of the dissident Orientals to Catholic Unity. In the meantime: each soul who needs my ministry will in a way be the Orient for me ».

He speaks with the voice of a prophet in speaking about the goal to be achieved, and the means that should and will be taken to achieve it. The principal means are the sacrifice of prayer: Christ's prayer, and the intercession of His Blessed Mother:

« To me it is very clear what the plan of God's grace is regarding mankind's Salvation: Christ yesterday, today, and the Same forever. Without me you can do nothing. Behold, I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world. For this reason, my desire to promote the return of the dissident Orientals to Catholic Unity is the same divine action by which Christ the Lord deigned to save those peoples, even through my ministry; that is: my liberty remaining intact, through my very free will, He offers Himself on the Holy Altar for their salvation, just as I myself, knowing and willing, fulfill the very eternal decrees. Thus Christ God, in no way violating human liberty, commands it, and moves it wherever He wills ... I renew my vows to Christ Jesus, the Lord, and to the Blessed Virgin Mary; may my assistance to souls stand as pledge ».

Just as he freely becomes an instrument carrying out Christ's own work, so does he identify himself with the activities of the Holy Mother:

« I fulfill the maternal cares of the Blessed Virgin toward the wandering children of the Orient ».

He states his doctrine on the Mother of Unity:

« ... the most Blessed Virgin Mary is another Eve, as we believe Christ the Lord to be another Adam. For this reason, I believe that her maternal providence remains perpetually with the Church, and according to the command given her by her Son dying on the Cross: Behold thy son ... behold thy Mother. In Heaven along with the Son who always intercedes for mankind, she also intercedes for us to the Father, so that what was truly done beneath the Son's Cross may be completed in Heaven ... The Most Holy Virgin is moved by such great love, and such great concern for the human race, that she is a victim of her Heart, because of her love for us. But since this same love for us is pledged because of her beatific love of God, she acts according to the fulness of her beatitude when interceding for the salvation of mankind ».

The longed for return of the separated brethren of the East

is assured by the infallibility of Christ's prayer, even though it is contingent upon our cooperation. It is cooperation which will be given freely, but nonetheless certainly. It was a year before Fr. Leopold's death when he wrote the following passage to his spiritual director Fr. Odoricus of Pordenone:

« ... I have the Orient always before my eyes, and I feel that the Lord invites me to celebrate the Holy Mysteries, except when circumstances demand otherwise in justice or piety, for the end that in its time the realization of the great promise might come: One fold and one Shepherd. *And certainly it will come* (italics his). Proceeding further he says, « ... this is my thought: He moves us his ministers to apply His merits to the dissident Orientals: that is, he prays for them insomuch as we celebrate the Sacred Mysteries for this end. So it is, therefore, that He Himself prays by means of us; and we know because of His own divine word that His prayer is always answered by God the Father. *Wherefore, infallibly* there will come about the great deed. Therefore, it is my duty to cooperate, I also, toward the end that in its time the great prophecy be accomplished. Here you have the whole of my thought ».

The words of Fr. Leopold fly like arrows straight to the target, while the affections of his soul leap no less readily and surely to the heart of the unity problem and find there the source of divine charity which alone is able to bind the East to the West again. It is unthinkable that this supernatural apostolate into which grace propelled him should have failed to bear fruits of grace in the hearts of many.

SALVATOR BUTLER, S. A.

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

An Open Letter of a Lay Orthodox Theologian, and a Reply

The proclamation by Pope John XXIII of the Second Vatican Council has been the occasion of much soul-searching among divided Christian groups, and particularly so among Catholics and members of the Orthodox Churches who already possess so much in common in their respective spiritual heritages. Thus in the last year or two, the dialogue between Catholics and Orthodox has become increasingly accentuated. A recent example of this is the following open letter of a prominent lay theologian in the Greek Orthodox Church, Dr Basil Moustakis, Secretary of the Christian Orthodox Association of Lay Theologians[1]. *We are presenting this letter to our readers in English form, together with a commentary by the Editor of* Unitas:

To the Spiritual Leaders, Bishops,
and Theologians of the Roman Catholic Church

Venerable Fathers:

We Orthodox believe that the present Pope really and ardently desires the *rapprochement* of the East and the West. We have remarked with reference to his announcement (of the Council) that « if God has permitted that he, and not another, be elected to the See of Rome, then it is certainly with a view to unity that He has done so ». And we are following with all our intelligence and with all our good will the development of this initiative.

It is an initiative that shows that Rome wishes to make resplendent again her ancient title of « president of Charity ».

The initial steps of the action undertaken by John XXIII have already brought about a certain satisfaction to your Church in its relations with us. The Orthodox Church – by its official and unofficial statements — has reacted favorably to the very pleasant prospect of a dialogue of reconciliation with Roman Catholicism.

---

[1] The open letter of Dr. Moustakis appeared in the Greek review *Enoria* for May 15, 1960.

But if this dialogue is to bear fruit, it must be prepared for by a mutual appreciation of objective principles and have as its prelude a concern for eliminating every non-spiritual element which bars the way to our coming together.

We should not like to remain with the idea that the Vatican is not disposed to effect these eliminations. The recently renewed respect of your theology for the venerable tradition of the East is, in fact, something that augurs well and is full of promise.

It is to this one point alone that the present letter should like to draw your enlightened attention. The undersigned has already, on another occasion, emphasized the homogeneity of faith and of life which unites the two Churches and which remains beneath the creviced surface of our well-known differences [2]. These observations were well received by both sides. What I should like to stress at the present moment is the fine concrete task which the hierarchy and the theology of your Church should assume in response to the necessity of revivifying and of extending that homogeneity of faith over and beyond disagreeable appearances.

What is this excellent task to which we refer, and what is this extraordinary necessity? It is a question, first of all, of a more accelerated and more generous progress of your theology in seeking out and bringing together the points held in common in both dogma and practice.

Nevertheless, even beyond this, that which would have the greatest practical significance in preparing a stable union would be the enrichment of the dogmatic theology and the liturgical practice of your Church by those corresponding Eastern elements regarding the value of which there is not the slightest question.

Underlying this there is a dangerous difference of conception which Orthodoxy would like to see dissipated as quickly as possible. Your thought tends to understand tradition as a mosaic of different colors according to localities. We, on our part, think that tradition varies from place to place, but that its principal lines must prevail everywhere, as the history of the Eastern Church makes evident. The richness, the purity, the harmony, the joy, the liberty which reign in the Eastern tradition are not, as far as we are concerned, questions of detail which the universal Church could circumscribe within one sector of the world and of which one would have no need elsewhere.

In any case, if, thanks to your inspired sollicitude, there were to come about a period in which that wealth could influence the

---

[2] Cf. the Greek Orthodox review *Anaplassis*, no. 74, April, 1959.

A French version of this article can be found in *Vers l'Unité Chrétienne* of November-December, 1959.

dogmatic thought, the liturgical practice, and generally the whole life of your Church, the most substantial component of the phenomenon of unity would be given.

It is this appeal, this thirst of Orthodoxy, which the present humble letter interprets as it addresses itself to you, Pastors and Doctors, with that frankness which is not temerity, but rather an entirely natural gesture in an atmosphere of cordial simplicity that is due to the venerated personality of the present Pope, who is at once so affable and so sympathetic.

All the Orthodox are aware of the extent to which Pope John XXIII loves the East and how much he belongs to it by his cordial affection. We are certain that his thought -- both by reason of his greatheartedness and by divine assistance — cannot be unaware of a truth so salient and serious as that which we have touched upon here, nor that round him, by reason of what was said previously, there exists in your ranks a preparation of minds and hearts and a profound comprehension which is capable of facilitating the development that is to be wished for.

With the highest esteem,

BASIL MOUSTAKIS

* * *

In this letter, Dr. Basil Moustakis, after a moving testimony of confidence in the initiative of Pope John XXIII for the *rapprochement* of the East and the West, urges Catholics to search out the points held in common by the two confessions and above all to enrich Catholic theology and liturgy with elements from the East. The following, I would say, is the essential part of the letter in question:

> « ... there is a dangerous difference of conception which Orthodoxy would like to see dissipated as quickly as possible. Your thought tends to understand tradition as a mosaic of different colors according to localities. We, on our part, think that tradition varies from place to place, but that its principal lines must prevail everywhere, as the history of the Eastern Church makes evident. The richness, the purity, the harmony, the joy, the liberty which reign in the Eastern tradition are not, as far as we are concerned, questions of detail which the universal Church could circumscribe within one sector of the world and of which one would have no need elsewhere.

Let us say immediately at the outset that we make ours the wishes of Dr. Moustakis: that every just nuance which is perceived

in Eastern theology be welcomed in the West, and that the richness of the Oriental liturgy be known, admired, and within the limits judged suitable by legitimate authority, be imitated in the Latin rite.

Nevertheless, to avoid any excess, we should like to make a few further remarks.

We can take it for granted that Dr. Moustakis would willingly admit that dogmatic values and authentic liturgical forms do exist in the West. Just as we welcome the truth with joy, even though it were to come from the East, so too will those of the Orient welcome it even though it were to originate in the West. As far as our liturgical forms are concerned, they often possess a fullness and impact such as to recommend them to all Christians.

Moreover, the differences which exist in the theological views of the East and those of the West have been often over-exaggerated. On this terrain, wisdom itself rather counsels that the different expositions be complemented by one another and thus be harmonized. The truth, after all, is one. For example, that which is called the Greek theory of the Trinity is conserved and elucidated in the teaching of Saint Augustine and of St. Thomas.

We readily acknowledge « the richness, the purity, the harmony, the joy, the liberty which reign in the Eastern tradition ». But we would be far from conceding that these qualities are lacking in the Western tradition, which is resonant with exultant alleluias and melodious antiphons. A pontifical Mass which is well celebrated is a feast for everyone and transports with delight even the simplest of those attending. The monks of Chevetogne, who carry out both the Latin and Byzantine rites, know how to give the Latin Mass an amplitude and an interior warmth which yield nothing to the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom.

We should like, above all, to point out that the Church is one and that it is at one and the same time Western and Eastern, Latin and Greek, Slavic and Arabic. All the splendors of the Orient belong to her; she has no need to look outside of herself for them. She permits to the different peoples who are her children to enrich their common prayer with the resources of their history and with forms in accordance with their temperament. Joy and sadness do not express themselves at Naples or at Palermo, or even at Athens or at Constantinople, as they do at Oslo and at Berlin. The fact remains that contact with the Orient will aid us in developing the virtualities of our own liturgy. The more peoples continue to communicate with each other, the more, naturally, will exchanges take place on the spiritual and liturgical plane under the benevolent control of authority.

We are in agreement with Dr. Moustakis in the matter of wishing for the Church the permanence and predominance of the same principal lines both in theological thought and in the liturgy; and we rejoice in the contributions of the Christian East. The intention of the observations we have made is solely to recommend in particular cases a great care for objectivity and comprehension.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

* * *

A RECENT QUESTION OF ECUMENICAL INTEREST IN GERMANY

At the end of May the Protestant Academy of Westphalia made public a question that it had posed to the Catholic Church with regard to an ecumenical discussion that had taken place earlier in the month between Dr. Ernest Kinder, the well-known Lutheran theologian, and the Abbé Heinz Schuette, who represented the Catholic position. Expressing their satisfaction with what had been proposed by the two exponents as a basis of future discussion between Catholics and Protestants, calculated to lead to a major comprehension on the part of both groups, the members of the Academy stated:

« This is why we are asking of the Roman Catholic Church if she approves, in both its intentions and its contents, the résumé of the Abbé Schuette's exposition made by the Reverend Karl Klinkhammer [1]*, in such wise that this presentation would correspond to the mind of the Catholic Church, and if she is prepared to engage in a dialogue with a view to the unity of Christians on that basis and in that sense ».*

The question propounded by the Protestant Academy was replied to by two eminent Catholic authorities: His Eminence, Cardinal Augustine Bea, president of the Secretariat for the Union of Christians, and His Excellency, Msgr. Lorenz Jaeger, the Archbishop of Paderborn. An English translation of both replies follows:

The Statement of His Eminence, Cardinal Bea

Dear Sirs: In my capacity as president of the « Secretariat for the Union of Christians », I have been asked by the Secretariat

---

[1] *Gespaltene Christenheit: darf es sein?* (*Is a Divided Christendom Permitted?*), by Karl Klinkhammer, based on the work of the Abbé Heinz Schuette, *Um die Wiedervereinigung im Glauben* (*For the Return to Unity in the Faith*) — both recently published by the firm of Freudebeul und Koenen, in Essen.

of State of His Holiness, Pope John XXIII to reply to your « Question to the Roman Catholic Church » which, in the meantime, I have also received personally. I am therefore happy to respond to this « question » according to the limits in which an answer is possible and efficacious at this time.

Nothing can better show to what point the Roman Catholic Church has at heart reciprocal comprehension and how she is disposed to encourage it than the fact of having created the Secretariat for the Union of Christians and of having entrusted its direction to a person who for years has been taken up with the question of union. In reference to this matter, Pope John XXIII declared in his *Motu proprio, Superno Dei nutu* of June 5 (Cf. *Osservatore Romano,* June 5, 1960, p. 1): « As a token of our affection and good will towards those who bear the name of Christian but are separated from this Apostolic See, to enable them to follow the work of the council and to find more easily the path by which they may arrive at that unity for which ' Jesus Christ prayed so ardently to His Heavenly Father ', We are establishing a special ' advisory board ' or secretariat, presided over by a Cardinal whom we shall choose ... ». All the questions and aspirations relating to this end can therefore be directed to this new Secretariat. The latter will then examine them with the assistance of experts, and, depending on the nature of the questions, will either itself furnish a reply, or else leave them for the Council to decide.

The attitude to be adopted personally with regard to private writings which pertain to this matter will be left ordinarily to the scientific discussion of competent private circles; the higher ecclesiastical authorities will express themselves on this subject only in particular cases.

With respect to the book by Abbé Heinz Schuette, the very fact that it has appeared with the *imprimatur* of the Bishop of Essen and that it has won the approbation of numerous Catholic bishops and theologians can already be an indication that its exposition is considered as being essentially in the spirit of the Roman Catholic Church. If any lack of precision or doubts exist on this or that important point, our Secretariat will always be ready to examine them and to clarify them in the light of whatever question will be submitted to it.

With expressions of deep esteem,

Cardinal AUGUSTINE BEA

* * *

The Response of His Excellency, Msgr. Lorenz Jaeger

The form in which this question is cast and the fact that it has been released to the press is not the ordinary mode of procedure, nor does it constitute a safe course to follow in the matter of theological discussion on controverted questions. But since the question has come to the knowledge of a wide public, I am obliged to render a reply.

In May 1960 there took place at the Protestant Academy of Bochum a dialogue between Dr. Kinder of Münster, Protestant professor of theology, and the Abbé Schuette of Grevenbroich, a Catholic professor, dealing with the theme: « Are there at the present time any stepping-stones calculated to prepare a union between the Protestant and Catholic Churches? »

In its bulletin no. 120 of 24 May, 1960, the Protestant Press Service wrote apropos of this subject: « The two theologians, who had not accorded their theses in advance, were in agreement in affirming that the theological formulations of the two Churches, notably concerning justification, the signification of the sacraments, the relation between Scripture and Tradition, had been brought together to a very marked degree. With the same unanimity, they demonstrated that the essential differences today between the Catholic and Protestant Churches are to be found in the conception of the Church and of the function of the priesthood ».

These affirmations correspond in fact to the outcome of numerous interconfessional conversations, prepared and conducted with care. On the Catholic side, a profound study of the sources has permitted a better understanding of the Protestant positions and the sense of their formulations; in like manner, on the Protestant side, many prejudices against the teaching of the Catholic Church have been dispelled or are in the process of disappearing.

However, one must not disregard the fact that a better reciprocal knowledge of doctrinal affirmations has also brought into relief more clearly than before the deepest divergences. The basic contradiction does not rest with the question of justification, but with that of the Church, with ecclesiastical functions, and with the apostolic succession of the bishops. This was already placed in evidence by the discussions of Ratisbon in 1541. Agreement was almost reached on the question of original sin and of justification, which at that time were at the very heart of the controversy. Accord was complete on the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption, such as they were expressed in the Credo, but what had been

overlooked were the divergences which existed about the subject of the action of the humanity of Christ in the work of salvation. The formula of union regarding justification, nevertheless, was rejected equally by Luther as by Rome, in such wise that even on this point a genuine agreement was not reached. But it was not this which made the conversations of Ratisbon run aground; they had previously stumbled over the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which had been defined by an Ecumenical Council. The Protestants were unwilling to recognize this conciliar decision, and it was thus that the conversations of Ratisbon collided with the question of the authority of the Councils, of the Church and its teaching office. They had run aground even before the rejection of the formula of union based on the doctrine of justification had become known to the parties concerned.

It is before a similar situation that we find ourselves today with respect to interconfessional conversations. The opposition does not seem irreducible as justification is concerned, but it is with reason that both Dr. Kinder and the Abbé Schuette have shown that « the essential differences today between the Catholic and Protestant Churches are to be found in the conception of the Church and of the functions of the priesthood ».

In consequence, Professor Kinder, in the course of the conversations at Bochum, maintained that the union of the Churches should rest with what is essential: the sacraments and the proclamation of the Word and that « no constitutional unity of the Churches is possible, for the Church is above all not an institution, but a community in the faith ». In saying this, Dr. Kinder was expressing the Protestant position and not the Catholic one. The *Augsburg Confession,* which is the most important doctrinal document of the Lutheran Church, declares in Article VII: « It suffices for the genuine unity of the Christian Churches that the Gospel be proclaimed by all in its purity and that the sacraments be distributed in conformity with the word of God; moreover, it is not necessary for the real unity of the Christian Churches that those ceremonies of human origin be everywhere the same ». The Latin text says even more explicitly: « And it is not essential to have everywhere the same traditions or human rites, or the same ceremonies created by men ».

It is this latter clause that Dr. Kinder takes as the basis of his position. This same clause is understood by the Abbé Schuette instead as envisaging only those ecclesiastical institutions of human right which are not divinely established. Actually, it is not necessary that these be everywhere the same. In his encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram* of June 29, 1959, Pope John XXIII declared ex-

pressly that in the Catholic Church unity in questions of faith does not stand in the way of diversity in that which concerns the opinions and the orientations of theologians, liturgical forms, and institutions of ecclesiastical law. Thus it is, for example, that the Canon Law for the Eastern Churches united with Rome differs on numerous points from western Canon Law. The constitution of those Churches where the Patriarchate is strongly accentuated is much less centralized than in the Church of the West, although the basic structure of the Church as such has been established by Christ Himself, with the supremacy of the successor of Peter and the episcopate of the successors of the Apostles, remains the same, as is evident. The piety of the Eastern Churches possesses equally its own particularities from the most ancient times — to mention but one thing, the cult of icons which is unknown in the West in that form. Even in the Church of the West and, moreover, in each diocese, one will find different kinds of piety — a fact which is easy enough to establish. Unity in diversity is an old Catholic principle. It is in this sense that the Abbé Schuette has found it possible to say that uniformity is not necessary with respect to theology, liturgical forms, etc.

But Dr. Kinder has given a very different sense to Article VII of the Augsburg Confession. To his mind « no constitutional unity of the Churches is possible ». In the ecclesiastical constitutions he sees but the creations of men, of ecclesiastical law, which, precisely because of this, can be diverse, since, according to him, Jesus Christ is not at their origin.

Catholics have this conviction, that the constitution of the Church, with the Pope as the center of unity and supreme and visible Pastor, with the bishops as successors of the Apostles, and therefore the Church with its hierarchical structure and its apostolic succession, has been instituted by Jesus Christ, Himself. We have the conviction that our point of view is founded on the New Testament and on the most ancient testimonies of tradition (St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Irenaeus of Lyons, Tertullian). But we see also that the difference of thought between Catholics and Protestants is manifest. This difference has escaped the interlocutors of Bochum — at least, if one is to believe what was reported in the press. Four centuries after the conversations of Ratisbon should make us have clear ideas on this subject. Contarini, who was the papal legate at the time and one of the most ardent partisans of reunion, said that he did not wish any superficial accord or that the same words should be vested with different meanings for the two parties. The same situation holds true today.

More than a century ago it was Johann Adam Mohler who said

that it was not by veiling over or disguising divergencies that the cause of unity is served, but by placing them in the full light of day. That is why he endeavored to expose the multiple origins of existent differences in such a way as to lay the foundation for fruitful discussion. He offers, as well, precious directives when he says that the idea that between Catholics and Protestants there is no basic doctrinal opposition, but only misunderstandings, does not lead to reconciliation but to reciprocal disdain. For when one is convinced that the other has no serious motives, he is apt to consider separation as something frivolous. Yet as Mohler has demonstrated in his *Symbolik,* real and serious divergencies of doctrine do exist, the whole depth of which must first of all be measured before the attempt is made to surmount them.

The book by the Abbé Schuette, *Um die Wiedervereinigung im Glauben,* is the outcome of lectures which he delivered to students of the region where he carries out his ministry, and he does not pretend to give an exhaustive and scientific picture of doctrinal differences. In order to encourage interconfessional dialogue, he shows where discussion can be had on certain important themes to be found in controversial works. He wishes to show that many of the desires of the Protestant Reformation find their realization in Catholic theology. He endeavors, with success, to reveal Catholic doctrine in a light that renders it comprehensible to others and facilitates understanding. It is likewise with good reason that he declares that if reunion were to come about, the Catholic Church would, by all means, require of our separated brethren to admit only that which is of divine right or of divine institution.

The Abbé Schuette knew that is practically impossible to have a simultaneous view of the fundamental divergencies « which exist in the texture of Protestant theology » (pp. 5-7) and that it was necessary for him, therefore, to make a choice corresponding to the purpose of his book. This is why he chose the statements of theologians who conform to Catholic teaching or who approach it very closely. The result is that the Abbé Schuette cites only brief passages from works by Protestant theologians and, for lack of space, he is unable to supply the context. He never presents the views of Protestant theologians whose whole thought is manifestly contrary to that of the Catholic Church. Except for a short allusion to Bultmann, he passes by those tendencies of Protestant theology and other analogues which, nevertheless, have a great influence on German Protestantism. Thus, there necessarily follows a unilateral image of Protestant theology. We do not hold this as a grievance against the author, since his intention was only to make the positive voices heard in view of an interconfessional dialogue. This

unilateral aspect, therefore, leads to judgments which are too optimistic and which are only valid for a small core of Protestant theologians and not for Protestant theology taken as a whole nor for the leaders of the Protestant Church.

The declarations regarding the history of the Reformation should also be passed through the crucible of criticism. Few Protestant historians will admit that in 1518 Luther still acknowledged fully the authority of the Pope and that he would have still recognized it subsequently if he had only known the true Catholic teaching on justification. However that may be, the Abbé Schuette has the merit of having demonstrated to an extensive circle of cultivated persons that many of the misunderstandings between Catholics and Protestants have been obviated and that the numerous points held in common are sufficient to permit us to hope that our divisions will come to an end, a consequence that is not a question of human effort, but above all a gift of the Holy Spirit. This is why our endeavor should be carried out in the spirit of these words of St. Paul which His Holiness John XXIII has seen fit to inscribe above the gateway to the Council: « But doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him who is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body, being compacted and fitly joined together, by what every joint supplieth, according to the operation in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity » (Ephesians, iv, 15-16).

This book, therefore, together with the commentary on it by the Abbé Klinkhammer, has given rise to new hope and, under this aspect, has met with an extensive appreciation. The *imprimatur* signifies simply that it contains nothing contrary to the teaching of the Church regarding faith and morals. The reviews made in theological periodicals have stressed the preliminary character of this book, its lack of precision, and its disconnectedness; and the author himself openly acknowledges this. Thus, his book has the merit of being an invitation and not a basis for a dialogue with a view to unity. On the Catholic side, the only basis that can be taken is the ensemble of the Church's teaching which is public and universal and has for its foundation Sacred Scripture and the apostolic Tradition. St. Thomas Aquinas tells us that the Scriptures are presented in all their entirety by the Church. Their significance for the dialogue between confessions has no need of being placed in relief, for it is universally recognized.

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

World Council Central Committee Welcomes Vatican Council and Unity Secretariat

The Central Committee of the World Council of Churches has welcomed the projected Second Vatican Council and the Holy See's newly created Secretariat on Christian Unity. The Committee, which determines the policy of the World Council with its 178 Protestant, Anglican, and Orthodox member churches, held its annual meetings in the latter part of August at St. Andrews, Scotland, a city which, among other things, is noted for its ruins of an ancient Catholic cathedral and its monument to the Protestant reformers.

The meeting brought together some 300 churchmen who represented member communions of the World Council in more than fifty countries. In addition, four Roman Catholic priests and two Russian Orthodox priests were present at the sessions of the Central Committee as observers. Among the Catholic observers was Monsignor Jan G. M. Willebrands of Holland whom Pope John XXIII recently named as secretary of the forthcoming Council's Secretariat for the Union of Christians.

In the opening session of the meeting at St. Andrews, the members of the Central Committee received a review of recent developments in the Roman Catholic Church with regard to Christian unity. The report, which was presented by the twelve-member Executive Committee, referred to the Council to be summoned by Pope John XXIII as an event which, « while not dealing directly with the question of unity is meant to have a considerable influence on the ecumenical situation ».

After calling attention to the Pope's establishment of the Secretariat on Christian unity, the report said that such developments reveal how much has happened since the encyclical *Mortalium Animos* of Pope Pius XI in 1928. « There is little doubt », the report noted, « that in the meantime the Vatican has come to see that the ecumenical movement is not inspired by vague humanitarianism but by basic Christian convictions ».

The report said further that the Holy See « has now decided

to become active in the ecumenical conversation » and that « it will no longer leave all initiative in this field to individual Roman Catholics but begin to speak and act itself in relation to other churches and the ecumenical organizations ».

With reference to the situation as it now stands, the Executive Committee made the following five points:

1. « The fact that a dialogue with the Roman Catholic Church has become possible is to be welcomed ».

2. « It is hoped that the informal discussions between Roman Catholic theologians and those of other churches which have been going on will not be entirely superceded by more official discussions. At the present stage it is precisely the informal discussions which could best contribute to the removal of misunderstanding ».

3. « No church should fear that the World Council of Churches will in any way speak or act for its member churches in matters of church union ».

4. « The World Council of Churches may, however, use such opportunities as may present themselves to make known to the new Vatican secretariat the basic convictions agreed upon by the Council's Assembly or Central Committee on such issues as religious liberty and Christian social action ».

5. « It should be remembered that the creation of the secretariat does not mean that any fundamental differences which exist between the Roman Catholic Church and the churches in the Council of Churches have been solved. The change is a change in procedure and climate. The opportunity for dialogue is to be grasped, but it means that the real problems will come to the fore ».

In the presentation of its report to the Central Committee, the Commission on Faith and Order of the W. C. C. observed that recent events have been forcing the Christian churches into various kinds of cooperation. The Commission emphasized the sense of urgency in promoting church unity.

« We must bring home the truth, « said its report, « that our present differences and divisions hinder the mission and the renewal of the Church and may obscure, even if they do not actually contradict, the gospel of reconciliation ».

A basic need is to draw the individual denominations out of isolation and into conference, according to the Faith and Order group. It noted further:

« The Roman Catholic Church constitutes so large a part of Christendom that we are bound to take it into consideration in our work for Christian unity. But we realize the very serious difficulties which arise both from their side and from ours, hinder any official or clearly defined relationship ».

Referring to the Commission's own pre-World Council origin as a separate branch of the Protestant ecumenical movement ,whose main purpose was to bring about reunion of the Christian churches, the report stated that Faith and Order is an aspect of the World Council in which the Roman Church has manifested interest, and that through their writings Roman Catholic theologians have made important contributions to discussions concerning unity. « We believe », the report said in this connection, « that this theological discussion should be pursued in whatever ways may be mutually acceptable ».

In making its report, the Faith and Order Commission requested the Central Committee for additional funds and a larger staff to carry out its work. This the Committee granted by providing two extra secretaries and an increased annual budget.

Anglican Bishop Oliver Tomkins of Bristol, England, who is chairman of the Faith and Order Commission, told representatives of the press that in historical terms Christian reunion was something quite remote. « It obviously represents« , he said, « an extremely distant goal, so far as we can see, though history does spring surprises ».

When asked his opinion of Pope John's attitude towards the ecumenical movement as reflected in the World Council, Bishop Tomkins said: « There is a great deal that has happened during his regime which indicates a fresh readiness to enter into contact with non-Catholics ».

In addition to the subject of relations with the Church of Rome, the members of the Central Committee also gave their attention to: the projected amalgamation of the World Council and the International Missionary Council; the question of religious liberty and proselytism; the doctrinal basis of membership in the World council, a modification of which will be proposed at the next General Assembly in New Delhi in 1961; and the religious and social significance of the African situation.

With reference to the basis for membership in the W. C. C., the Central Committee voted in favor of the following revision: « The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit ».

Before it can be finally accepted by the World Council, the revised statement must have the approval of two-thirds of the Third General Assembly.

Commenting on the suggested change, the Central Committee made clear that it was not intended to be a full statement of the

Christian faith but simply a starting point of conversation and collaboration; and that it « does no more than make explicit what has all along been implicit in the present Basis, but that it meets the general desire to include a reference to the Scriptures and to the Three Persons of the Undivided Trinity, and at the same time to emphasize in biblical language the central purpose governing the association together of the member churches of the World Council »[1].

The three Catholic priests who attended the Central Committee meeting at St. Andrews in addition to Monsignor Willebrands are: Bernard Leeming, S. J., professor of dogmatic theology at Heythrop College near Oxford, and two members of the Dominican Order, Father Jerome Hamer and Father Réné Beaupère. In a statement for the press, Father Leeming was of the opinion that the new secretariat for unity headed by Cardinal Bea would serve as a most useful channel of communication between the Holy See and the ecumenical movement. (*NC. - EPS*).

* * *

Faith and Order Commission Holds Triennal Meeting

Previous to the sessions of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, the hundred members of the Commission on Faith and Order also held their triennial meeting at St. Andrews from August 3 to 8. Made up of theologians and leading clergymen from Orthodox, Anglican, and Protestant Churches of five continents, the Commission devotes its attention to all those questions affecting the unity of the various Christian groups. It is a derivation of the movement of the same name which assumed a more concrete form at the conferences of Lausanne (1927), Edinburgh (1937), and Lund (1952). Its directors likewise played a decisive part in the formation of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam in 1948.

It will be recalled that the specific task of Faith and Order is to « proclaim the essential unity of the Church of Christ » and to keep constantly before the conscience of the World Council and its member churches « the duty of manifesting

---

[1] The number of the churches now forming the World Council has risen to 178. At the St. Andrews' meeting of the Central Committee, eight new churches were approved for membership: six Protestant bodies in Asia and Africa, an independent Anglican church in East Africa, and the ancient Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch and All the East.

that unity, indispensable for the evangelization of the world ». It is to this end that the Commission studies the barriers erected between the Churches by doctrine, ecclesiastical order, the liturgy, traditions, and likewise non-theological factors of a social or political nature, etc. The Commission seeks out the means by which essential unity may be rendered visible, but thus far has been unable to reach a genuine agreement: certain of its members feel that unity is purely spiritual and has no need of any expression of ecclesiastical order, while others judge it indispensable that this unity be visible in the very organization of the Church.

In his opening address at the triennial meeting, Dr. Douglas Horton, president of the Commission and former dean of Harvard Divinity School in Boston, declared that the problem of unity was that each one viewed it according to his own specifications. Yet, he said, the great majority of the member churches of the World Council were intent on its realization. Dr. Horton stressed that the unity sought was not something legal, not simply a cooperation between Christians, but « a unity which makes of the churches a Church obvious to the world to which it is sent — that is, a churchly unity ... the unity of the living organism of the Church ». The president of the Commission summed up his conception of essential unity in these terms: one Baptism, one Gospel, the breaking of the same bread; one common life of witness and of service; one ministry and the requisite for membership recognized by all; and the possibility of acting and of speaking in concert when circumstances call for it.

Speaking also on the same occasion, Dr. A. M. Ramsey, who is the Anglican Archbishop of York, declared among other things that if Christendom were to form itself into three or four great blocs, this result would run the risk of becoming an obstacle to genuine unity. The answer to that difficulty he said was the search for the truth and submission to it, at whatever cost.

This problem was touched upon as well by Dr. Keith Bridston, who is the staff secretary of the the Department of Faith and Order. In a report read to the members of the Commission he acknowledged that the various churches had exhibited a « new and unprecedented commitment to stay together ». Yet while this could be considered a great step forward, it could also at the same time be a definite obstacle to further progress. « The danger », Dr. Bridston pointed out, « is that having taken such a step and having formed a World Council of Churches, this may be considered enough ».

Successive sessions of the Faith and Order meeting were given over to a consideration of the reports presented by the four theo-

logical commissions created at the Lund Conference in 1952 and dealing with these topics: Christ and the Church, Tradition, Worship, and Institutionalism. The first of these reports is to appear very shortly under the title *One Lord, One Baptism;* this has been entrusted to the S.C.M. Press in London and will constitute the first of a series of publications sponsored by Faith and Order.

Among those who are at present engaged in preparing these studies are the following members of the Commission: Bishop Anders Nygren of Lund, Sweden; Professor K. B. Skydsgaard of Copenhagen; Professor Georges Florovsky of Cambridge, Mass; Professor Joseph A. Sittler of Chicago; Principal J. R. Chandran of Bangalore, India; Dean Walter G. Muelder and Professor Nils Ehrenström of Boston, Mass. (*EPS*)

* * *

Pope John XXIII Appoints Members and Consultants of Unity Secretariat

As a further step in preparation for the Second Vatican Council, His Holiness Pope John XXIII recently appointed ten members to the Secretariat for the Union of Christians, which is headed by His Eminence, Cardinal Augustine Bea. Its secretary is Monsignor J.G.M. Willebrands of Warmond, Holland.

Those designated by the Pope as members are the following: Mgr. Lorenz Jaeger, Archbishop of Paderborn; Mgr. Joseph-Marie Martin, Archbishop of Rouen; Mgr. John Carmel Heenan, Archbishop of Liverpool; Mgr. François Charrière, Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva, and Fribourg; Mgr. Emile de Smedt, Bishop of Bruges; Mgr. Pieter-Antoon Nierman, Bishop of Groningen, Netherlands; Msgr. Josef Hoefer, ecclesiastical councillor of the German Embassy to the Vatican; Msgr. Michael Maccarrone, secretary of the Pontifical Commission of Historic Sciences; Fr. Charles Boyer, S. J., president of the Unitas Association in Rome; and Father James Cunningham of the Congregation of St. Paul the Apostle.

Pope John has likewise called upon sixteen Catholic priests of both the secular and regular clergy to act as consultants to the Secretariat. Among these are: Msgr. Henry F. Davis of England; the Rev. John Vodopivec, professor at the Propaganda Fide College in Rome; the Rev. Pierre Dumont, Benedictine, Rector of the Greek College in Rome; Father Christopher Dumont, Dominican, of the Istina Center in Paris; Father Gregory Baum, Augustinian, of Canada; Father Maurice Bevenot of England and Father Gustav

Weigel of Woodstock, Maryland, both of the Society of Jesus; Father Edward Hanahoe, of the Society of the Atonement, Graymoor, N. Y.; and Father George Tavard of the United States.

* * *

Cardinal Bea Advocates Cooperation and Dialogue between Christians

His Eminence Augustine Cardinal Bea, S. J. declared on a visit to Freiburg, Germany, that harmonious cooperation between the various Christian denominations is a present-day necessity. The Cardinal declared that although Christians may differ on faith, they are called to cooperate in all fields not directly concerned with faith. Such collaboration, he said, should extend to the political, economic, and social fields.

Later in the course of a visit to a nuns' convent at Hegne, near Konstanz, Cardinal Bea said: « The ecumenical council will not bring us unity of Christianity at once. But if we implore the Holy Spirit, it may result in showing the way toward a true unity gradually ».

After his return from the International Eucharistic Congress at Munich, Cardinal Bea had occasion to address a meeting in his home town of Riedböhringen, Germany, and emphasized the timeliness of intensified conversation between Catholics and other Christians. He held it to be of the highest importance that the interconfessional dialogues of a non-official character between Catholic and Protestant theologians should continue. These conversations, he pointed out, have already led to a certain *rapprochement* on several theological points. The movement of *Una Sancta* in Germany under the leadership of Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger of Paderborn, he said, was an outstanding example of this. (*La Croix*)

* * *

Cardinal Montini Discusses Ecumenical Council at University Conference

According to His Eminence Giovanni Cardinal Montini, Archbishop of Milan, the coming ecumenical council will be a striking reminder to the world of Christ's presence and will call upon all to turn to Him. The Cardinal was the first speaker at a series of sessions sponsored by the Catholic University of Milan at Mendola Pass and dealing with prospects of the Second Vatican Council.

In his address, Cardinal Montini said that Pope John XXIII, in summoning the council, had refuted two long-standing accusations against the Church:

In the first place, he stated, the convoking of the council confirms the unreality of the theory that councils are imposed on the popes. Secondly, the Pope's action disproves the claim that with the proclamation of the doctrine of papal infallibility in 1870 councils would no longer be summoned.

The Cardinal noted that while the council will no doubt deal with much of the unfinished business left when the First Vatican Council had to be adjourned in 1870, other very important subjects will also be considered. Among the foremost of these will be that of the reunification of Christians.

« The council », declared Cardinal Montini, « reaffirms decisively a new course toward peace and unity, since it is not promoted because of polemics, excommunications, or wars, but for the programmatic intention of reaching a conciliation, according to the expression used by Pope John XXIII in his first encyclical *Ad Petri Cathedram* ».

The Cardinal Archbishop of Milan was also a guest speaker at Assisi in late August for the study session organized by Don Giovanni Rossi at the « Pro Civitate Cristiana », the theme of which was « Credo in unam Ecclesiam ».

There the well-known prelate told the study session that unity is an essential and distinguishing mark of the Church of Christ and that its unity derives from the papacy. « The Church is one », he said, « but it is not a uniform and passive entity representing a community of brothers; it is instead an organic and active entity making it the mother of its sons. In other words, it is a composite entity with a marvelously harmonious structure ».

Turning to the subject of the papacy, Cardinal Montini said: « We saw it appear like a solitary and single phenomenon in the midst of humanity, almost like a point of comparison and of rally and surrounded by a singular and universal foretoken that the destinies of civilization must revolve around it; not because it possesses riches, means, strength and power, but because it has understanding for every human need, because it is adverse to every human injustice, because it has courage for every ideal principle, the humility and the dignity of the man of God ». (*NC*)

* * *

Catholic and Protestant Leaders Discuss Views at German Meeting

More than 100 Catholic priests, Protestant ministers, and lay persons took part in the three-day annual *Una Sancta* meeting at Niederaltaich, Germany at the end of August.

The work of *Una Sancta* (One and Holy) — the great dialogue between Catholics and Protestants — is carried out all across Germany. It includes research centers, discussion groups, radio and television addresses — all of which are aimed at the ultimate reunion of Christians.

Presiding over the sessions were Archbishop Lorenz Jaeger of Paderborn, Bishop Simon Konrad Landersdorfer of Passau, and Abbot Emanuel Heufelder of the Benedictine Abbey of Niederaltaich.

The opening day of the meeting was dedicated to meditation on the Eucharist, the unity of Christians, and the drama of their separation; while the discussion for the following two days centered about the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.

An evaluation of the situation following the meeting was that the differences between the central positions of Catholics and Lutherans were much smaller than generally realized. However, it appeared that there is a mutual lack of comprehension on terms and formulas. The position held by Calvinists is much more divergent. (*The Pilot*).

* * *

Greek Orthodox Leader Views Reunion Movement as Promising

Speaking recently at Detroit, Archbishop Iakovos, primate of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, declared that, to his mind, the move for reunion of the Eastern Orthodox Churches with the Roman Catholic Church is at its most promsing stage in history. The ranking prelate, who is one of the presidents of the World Council of Churches, stated that the « friendly attitudes » of both His Holiness Pope John XXIII and Athenagoras I, Patriarch of Constantinople, had created the most promising atmosphere for Christian unity since the ancient rift between the Churches of the East and West.

Archbishop Iakovos, whose archdiocese counts some 1,150,000 members, said that world political tensions had failed to dampen the hopes for reunion — hopes which were given a fresh impetus with the proclamation of an ecumenical council by Pope John last year.

The Greek Orthodox leader said that the devotion of Catholics to the Virgin Mary would prove no deterrent to unity with Eastern Orthodox believers. « We cannot separate the Son from the mother, and we do not think this is either superstition or idolatry », the archbishop said. « We believe that inasmuch as she was the most highly chosen one, she is the most blessed one ... The difference is that whereas it is dogma with Rome, it is tradition with us. We believe and practice, but we have never made it dogma. Although we have no such term as Mariology, Marianism is very real and true for us ».

Archbishop Iakovos was in Detroit to officiate at special services honoring the feast of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary at a Greek Orthodox church.

Again in September the Greek Orthodox prelate returned to the theme of unity when he addressed some 650 delegates assembled in Buffalo, N. Y. for the fifteenth annual convention of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America. Declaring that the Orthodox Church is by its nature ecumenical, Archbishop Iakovos said that it « does not fear honest and constructive relationships with other churches ».

« It is important to note », he continued, « that the Roman Catholic Church, as well as the Protestant churches, have expressed themselves in an increasingly respectful manner toward our church. This is due in great measure to the acceptance on the part of the Greek Orthodox Church of its rightful role in the center of the ecumenical movement ». (*NC*)

* * *

Wording of Unity Octave Intentions Modified

The wording of the intentions of the Chair of Unity Octave has recently been amended to eliminate « overtones that were not originally intended ».

The revisions include such changes as referring to the Orthodox as « eastern Christians » instead of « Oriental separatists »; and using the term « reconciliation » with the Holy See instead of « submission ».

The emendations in the program of prayer for unity were made public at Graymoor, New York, by the central office of the Chair of Unity Apostolate which is directed by the Franciscan Friars of the Atonement, the community founded by Father Paul Wattson. The previous wording of the intentions had been in effect for 47 years.

The changes recalled revisions made in the liturgy for Holy Week by His Holiness Pope John XXIII, who brought about the altering of phrases which might have been offensive to the Jews.

A spokesman for the Friars said that the revision had been under consideration for some time, after consultation with Church authorities in the United States and abroad, and was undertaken at the direction of the Father General of the Society of the Atonement, the Very Reverend Angelus F. Delahunt, S. A. Explaining that there was no change of theological principle involved, the spokesman said that the changes in wording were made in view of the fact that « expressions that were quite customary at the time of their origin have shifted in connotation and have assumed overtones that were not originally intended ».

The following is the new wording of the intentions for each day of the Unity Octave, with the former wording in parentheses:

January 18: « The union of all Christians in the one true Faith and in the Church ». (Formerly: « The return of all ' other sheep ' to the one fold of St. Peter, the one shepherd »).

January 19: « The return of separated eastern Christians to communion with the Holy See ». (Formerly: « The return of all Oriental separatists to communion with the Apostolic See »).

January 20: « The reconciliation of Anglicans with the Holy See ». (Formerly: « The submission of Anglicans to the authority of the Vicar of Christ »).

January 21: « The reconciliation of European Protestants with the Holy See ». (Formerly: « That the Lutherans and all other Protestants of continental Europe may return to Holy Church »).

January 22: « That American Christians become one in union with the Chair of Peter ». (Formerly: « That Christians in America may become one in communion with the Chair of St. Peter »).

January 23: « The restoration of lapsed Catholics to the sacramental life of the Church ». (Formerly: « The return to the sacraments of lapsed Catholics »).

January 24: « That the Jewish people come into their inheritance in Jesus Christ ». (Formerly: « the conversion of the Jews »).

January 25: « The missionary extension of Christ's kingdom throughout the world ». (Formerly: « The missionary conquest of the world for Christ »). (*NC*)

BOOK REVIEWS

JOSEPH GILL, S. J., *The Council of Florence,* Cambridge University Press 1959, pp. xviii, 453 (47/6d).

The Council of Florence, which began in Ferrara in 1438, and petered out in Rome between 1445 and 1447, was the last serious attempt made to re-unite the Latin West and the Greek Orthodox church after centuries of schism. It failed, though not through want of trying on both sides. On the Greek side, it is true, there was latent mistrust in the venture from the beginning, but they were in grave political difficulties and needed help from the West, and were therefore prepared to negotiate. On the Latin side, the endemic weakness wrought by conciliarism on the fifteenth century papacy, and the preoccupation of western princes with their own political ambitions and consequent indifference to the desperate plight of the Christian East, wrecked the bright hopes of Eugenius IV. It only needed the long threatened fall of Constantinople to become a reality in 1453 for the intransigeant anti-unionists to convince their fellow Greeks that the Latin West had never seriously intended to support them against the Turks, and that their theologians had been talked or bribed into the Decree of Union. And so those years of interminable theological and political argument came to nothing.

This fascinating, even if sombre chapter of Church history has never been more clinically and successfully analysed than in Fr. Joseph Gill's recent study, *The Council of Florence.* What makes the work so successful is that Professor Gill, as a distinguished Greek scholar, has been able to use to the full the recently edited Greek sources for this Council; a formidable work in itself, incidentally, in which the author has played a notable part. It is this which gives the book its balance and its overriding authority.

A very useful introduction discusses the reliability of these sources before Fr. Gill traces the difficulties which arose within the Church after the Roman emperors had transferred their capital to Constantinople. This background history is essential to a proper understanding of the whole quarrel between the Latin West and the Orthodox East, and readers whose knowledge of Byzantine history is slight will find it especially rewarding. The author is

wise to include a chapter on Martin V's preliminary work towards reunion, and particularly to discuss conciliarism, because it is to be one of his most important conclusions that if the Council of Florence failed to achieve permanent union, it certainly dealt a death blow to those conciliarist theories which were undermining the whole structure of the papacy in the fifteenth century.

With these carefully written preliminary chapters behind him, the author then devotes the core of the book to the Council itself. The arrival of the Greeks, the delicate skirmishing for position, the bitter and protracted theological arguments over *dia, ek,* and the *Filioque* clause, and over Purgatory, the patience and prudence of that attractive emperor John VIII Palaeologus, whose role in the Council was decisive, Eugenius IV's grave financial difficulties in trying to meet the expenses of the Greek contingent, the move to Florence, and the climactic Decree of Union are minutely and graphically described. The reception of the union in both the West and the East, however, provides a sombre anticlimax, and an illuminatingly objective epilogue analyses the causes of the Council's heavy failure.

There is now, of course, a timeliness about this work which was quite unknown to Fr. Gill when he began it, and the knowledge that there is soon to be another General Church Council, at which the possibility of a *rapprochement* between the Catholic Church and the Greek Orthodox is certain to be discussed, will inevitably remind most Christians of this previous attempt in 1439. Fr. Gill's study, therefore, is a valuable corrective to those who piously believe that because all men desire it, reunion is merely a matter of time. A thorough and objective study of the difficult problems involved is, in fact, the first necessary preliminary to reunion. The climate of opinion which a scholarly work of this calibre is helping to forge, therefore, is more realistic and therefore more hopeful than ever before. Immensely erudite yet easy to read, objective and authoritative, it will be a very long time before this history of the Council of Florence needs to be rewritten, and by avoiding partisanship of any kind, Professor Gill has rendered a genuine service to the cause of Christian unity.

LESLIE MACFARLANE

LESSLIE NEWBIGIN, *The Reunion of the Church.* New and revised edition. SCM Press, London 1960, 36+186 pages. Price 21 s.

This book is the second edition of an older book of the same title, with a new introduction. The original book written in summer 1946 was composed as a defence of the *Scheme of Church Union in*

South India, which was then still a scheme and not a fact, for the new Church was not inaugurated till September 1947. The author, a Scottish Presbyterian, was impelled to the task because he thought the assailants of the *Scheme,* which he heartily approved of, were for a variety of reasons misjudging it. Indeed they were approaching the problem from the wrong angle, since the only sound line of approach was the doctrine of justification by faith. On this basis he analyses, with the New Testament always as his starting point and with an abundance of devout and penetrating reflections on it, the idea of Church under various aspects and always concludes to its basic spiritual essence which has its physical counterpart and external practices, but which ultimately is never confined by them. That leads up to his examination of the *Scheme* and the method of the (then prospective) Church of South India, which he finds justified on all counts.

Perhaps the most interesting part of this second edition is the new introduction, an essay of some twenty-eight pages, for this has been written when the C. S. I. is no longer a project only but an historical phenomenon more than ten years old. The author was one of the new bishops of the new Church and so speaks with the authority of experience when he declares his surprised pleasure at the way in which the office of bishop has been accepted and increasingly appreciated in South India. But he has not changed his earlier views about the nature of that office, that it is not essential to the Church or essential for valid Orders (only he would not use the word 'valid') — 'the priesthood of all believers' is as true now as ever it was, and the 'anomaly' of presbyters episcopally ordained and presbyters not episcopally ordained co-existing as equals in the C. S. I. now and even after the 30-year period does not bother him: indeed the opposite would be against his theological principles. Logically the schemes of the new Churches, composed of elements of very diverse denominational origin, projected for Ceylon and North India, meet with his just criticism, for their device of recommissioning services, designed to allay Anglican scruples and not overtly to rouse Noncomformist prejudices, is not, as he says, quite honest — and, he would say, at all necessary.

The question that he raises in the end — Will the C. S. I. become a model to be followed and the start of a very much larger union or not? — he has to leave unanswered, but one senses his suspicion that it will not, but will be 'just one more denomination'.

This book is very stimulating reading, patently honest, and the Catholic can agree with very much of what he reads in it, even

if he must often lay the stress differently from Bishop Newbigin, for there is much truth in the phrase ' Justification by faith ', provided that there is not added ' alone '.

JOSEPH GILL, S. J.

The Quest for Church Unity, Matthew Spinka (New York: Macmillan Co., 1960, 85 pp., $ 2.50).

No one denies that the quest for religious unity in modern times, like the quest for the Holy Grail in a bygone era, is a crusade filled with singular promise as well as significant potentiality for Christendom. Has the time arrived, however, to take a more realistic and less idealistic view of the aims of the Ecumenical Movement? Should one approach the quest for unity from the standpoint of real possibility rather than with laudatory but improbable hopes? Matthew Spinka, repeating the substance of his lectures delivered at the Hartford Seminary Foundation in Connecticut, U.S., declares emphatically that a more sober assessment of the Ecumenical Movement and a more practical revision of its aims must be made at the present time.

The author, first of all, briefly reviews the history of the quest for religious unity. He mentions the now familiar landmarks: Lambeth Conferences, Life and Work, Faith and Order, the World Council of Churches, together with the stalwart champions of unity connected with the formation and progress of the Ecumenical Movement. Spinka then distinguishes two parties which have arisen within the ranks of those seeking unity. Supporters of the federative principle of Christian unity as embodied in the World Council of Churches form one group. They are called the « minimalists » or those who hold an objective of unity among Protestants. On the other side are the ecumenists or « maximalists »: those who aim at including all Christians in the *Una Sancta.*

Mr. Spinka devotes himself principally to the position of the ecumenists. He finds that they are far apart in their thinking regarding both the goal they seek and the means they look to for attaining it, In order to be more objective, however, in his estimation of the Ecumenical Movement and of its chances for success, the author makes a detailed examination of the difficulties facing it. This he does by studying the positions mostly of the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches in doctrine, ecclesiology, sacraments, and government. He has no trouble, from the references cited, in showing the impossibility of integrating the various theological systems, Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox into an ecumenical

synthesis. Matthew Spinka concludes, therefore, that « to aim at ecumenicity in the maximal sense of that word is at present an unattainable ideal, a mirage ». (p. 66).

The next step is to search for something more possible of achievement. If all-inclusive ecumenicity is not feasible, then a limited objective which aims at the unity of some Protestant communions, if not all Protestantism, may be possible. Spinka examines two plans for such limited unity, the Greenwich Plan and the Church of South India, and claims that both are unsatisfactory. This leads the author to his own proposal for unity: 1. a recognition and acceptance of Jesus Christ as the supreme and final revelation of God; 2. the acceptance of Scripture as the witness to the revelation of God; and 3. an agreement on the essentials of the Christian faith. On such a basis, Spinka feels, a limited Protestant unity is possible.

Mr. Spinka's treatment of the quest for unity is marred by several disfigurements. For one thing, he appears to harbor a personal resentment against the Catholic Church. The Assumption of the Blessed Virgin is declared to be « quite an assumption! » (p. 34); St. Bernadette is « subnormal » (p. 39); sacramentals are « paraphernalia » (p. 54); and he is surprised that the Catholic Church has not « infiltrated » the Ecumenical Movement in order to mold it « in its own image » (p. 44).

Moreover, the author seems too anxious to destroy rather than to build up. The Ecumenical Movement renders its advocates « subject to the charge of almost fantastic unreality » (p. 67). The Greenwich Plan is unacceptable. (Apparently the author is unaware that the Plan has been officially shelved). The United Church of Christ in the United States is faulty in polity; and the status of the Church of South India is too provisional and too uncertain.

Mr. Spinka's own proposal for « minimalist » unity among Protestants only is not without its own difficulties. He declares that his approach is « realistic », yet at the same time does not assume that it is anything more than « another private opinion among the vast flood of similar personal views » (p. 76). Spinka declares that he recognizes the staggering number of various interpretations, additions, emphases, and other variations of the basic Christian message. He cheerfully yields « to all and sundry a reasonable liberty of interpretation, provided the essentials are not thereby subverted » (p. 81). But who is to decide this point? For example, must all adherents to his plan for unity accept the one-God-in-three-self-revelations interpretation of the Trinity which he says is « absolutely necessary » (p. 78)? Finally, the author does not seem to have a very clear idea of visible unity. For him real unity is a spiritual

entity. Freedom of doctrinal interpretation, a fellowship in Christ, and maximum absence of « institutionalism » are required in his plan. But do not these elements already exist? Why look for anything further?

Nevertheless, despite the defects mentioned, Matthew Spinka's *Quest for Church Unity* is valuable for setting forth the position of the « limited objective » school. It helps to remind us, once again, how difficult the task of Christian unity is and therefore how much each should pray.

ROGER MATZERATH, S. A.

GEORGE H. TAVARD, *Holy Writ or Holy Church: The Crisis of the Protestant Reformation.* London: Burns & Oates, 1959, pp. 250.

Sola Scriptura, the Reformers were wont to say, « Scripture alone » — denying thus the authority of tradition and of the Church. Catholic theologians are in agreement at least in saying: « Scripture and the Church » in order to signify that Scripture has need of an authentic interpretation, without which its meaning would often remain obscure or ambiguous, or much less explicit.

The Church, assisted by the Holy Spirit, determines the sense of revelation according to the needs of the times. This sense decided upon by the Church is transmitted from generation to generation to generation. It follows, therefore — at least in this sense — that revelation has two sources: Scripture and Tradition. For is it not true that there is another indispensable concept — that of tradition and its necessity? Are there not verities of faith which we do not find in Sacred Scripture and which are known only through revelation and oral tradition? And is this not the very same thing that was defined by the Council of Trent? Certainly, Bellarmine and Canisius were of this mind, and so, too, is Father Lennerz (cf. *Gregorianum,* 1959, published by the Gregorian University, Rome). Father Tavard, along with a few contemporary authors, is of a different opinion.

In discussion with Protestants, it would be sufficient to show the necessity of the Church's interpretation. For the full truth of a doctrine, the obvious sense of the Council of Trent as well as the exigencies of theology leads us to admit that there were truths revealed before the death of the last Apostle simply by word of mouth; which is not to say that they continued to exist for a long time without being written down; however, they do not make up a part of the canonical Scriptures.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.